

UND PA 369 G65 1878

URIS LIBRARY

Cornell University Library PA 369.G65 1878

Syntax of the moods and tenses of the G



3 1924 012 550 285



The original of this book is in the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in the United States on the use of the text.

SYNTAX

OF

THE MOODS AND TENSES

 \mathbf{OF}

THE GREEK VERB.

BY

WILLIAM W. GOODWIN, Ph. D.,

SEVENTH EDITION, REVISED.

' BOSTON: 2 GINN AND HEATH. 3 1878.

URIS LIBRARY
APR 2 2 1987



Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1860, By W. W. GOODWIN,

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

University Press: Welch, Eigelow, & Co., Cambridge,

Cornell University Library

Gift of the Estate of PROFESSOR HARRY CAPLAN '16



Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1860, By W. W. GOODWIN,

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

PREFACE

TO THE FIFTH EDITION.

SINCE the publication of the second edition of this work in 1865, several changes of expression and many corrections have been made, which it is impossible to enumerate in full. In preparing the fourth edition in 1870, and the fifth edition in 1873, the work has been carefully revised; several sections and notes have been rewritten, and some notes have been added. The only changes which can affect references made to the earlier editions (besides those mentioned on page v.) will be found in § 10, 1, Remark; § 11, Note 7; § 18, 1, Note; § 19, Note 6; § 66, 2, Note 3; § 78, Note; and § 114, 2, Note: these have been added since the second edition was printed. Changes of expression and additions will be found in the Remark before § 12; § 18, 1; § 23, 2, Note 3; § 37, 1; § 45, Note 7 (a); § 69, 1; § 70, 1; § 86, Note 1 (b); § 88, Remark; and § 89, 2, Note 1 and Remark 1; not to mention others of less importance. The most important change made in the fifth edition will be found in the statement of the classification of conditional sentences (§ 48). This has been adopted to make clearer the position of the present and past "general suppositions" which have the subjunctive and optative in Greek (§ 51), as opposed to the present and past "particular suppositions" which have the simple indicative (§ 49, 1). This distinction of these two classes in protasis is a striking peculiarity of Greek syntax; most languages having a single form of expression for both particular and general conditions here, as the Greek has in other kinds of conditions. not state too distinctly, that the chief peculiarity of my classi-

PREFACE.

fication of conditional sentences consists in treating present and past general conditions as closely allied to ordinary present and past conditions (being actually united with them in one class in most languages, and occasionally even in Greek). and as only remotely connected, at least in sense, with the externally similar forms of future conditions which have the subjunctive and optative. This relation is especially obvious when we see that ἐὰν ποιῆ as a general supposition is occasionally represented by εὶ ποιεί, whereas ἐὰν ποιῆ in a future condition is equivalent to el ποιήσει in the indicative. I have explained this at greater length in the Philologus. Vol. XXVIII. pp. 741-745 (Göttingen, 1869), and in a paper read before the American Philological Association in July, 1873. The change in § 48 has made necessary slight changes of expression in § 12; § 13, 1; § 20; § 21, 1; § 49, 1; § 51; § 60; § 61, 1; and § 62. An index to the examples which have been added in the later editions is given on page 242.

HARVARD COLLEGE, September, 1873.

The last-mentioned paper, in which the change in the classification of conditional sentences made in the edition of 1873 is explained and the whole system is defended, may be found in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1873, and in the Journal of Philology, Vol. V., No. 10.

September, 1875.

PREFACE

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

In the first edition of the present work, published in 1860, I attempted to give a plain and practical statement of the principles which govern the relations of the Greek Moods and Tenses. Although many of these principles were established beyond dispute, there were others (and these often the most elementary) upon which scholars had long held the most opposite opinions. Upon many of these latter points I presented new views, which seemed to me to explain the phenomena of the language more satisfactorily than any that had been advanced. The favorable opinion of scholars has confirmed my belief, that some such attempt as I have made was demanded by the rising standard of classical scholarship in this country, and has given me reason to hope that my labor has not been entirely a thankless one.

The progress in grammatical science in this century has been made step by step, like that in every other science; and so it must long continue to be. He who imagines that every important principle of Greek and Latin syntax is as well understood and as clearly defined as the rules for addition and multiplication in Arithmetic, has not yet begun to learn. It is no disparagement of even the highest scholars, therefore, to say that they have left much of the most important work to be lone by their successors.

The vague notions so often expressed on the Greek Moods, even by scholars of otherwise high attainments, are in strange contrast with the accuracy demanded by scientific scholarship in other departments. If the study of language is to retain its present place (or indeed any prominent place) in the mental

ii PREFACE.

discipline of youth, it must be conducted on strictly scientific principles, and above all with scientific accuracy. On no other ground can we defend the course of elementary grammatical training, which is the basis of all sound classical scholarship. An elementary grammar should be as short as the best scholar can make it, but it should be as accurate as a chapter in Geometry. To those who cannot appreciate the importance of accuracy in scholarship, or even distinguish it from pedantry, to those who cannot see the superiority of the Greek in this respect over Chinese or Choctaw, it is useless to speak; but surely no scholar can fail to see that an accurate knowledge of the uses of the Greek Verb, with its variety of forms, each expressing its peculiar shade of meaning, must be indispensable to one who would understand the marvellous power of the Greek language to express the nicest distinctions of thought.

One great cause of the obscurity which has prevailed on this subject is the tendency of so many scholars to treat Greek syntax metaphysically rather than by the light of common sense. Since Hermann's application of Kant's Categories of Modality to the Greek Moods, this metaphysical tendency has been conspicuous in German grammatical treatises, and has affected many of the grammars used in England and America more than is generally supposed. The result of this is seen not merely in the discovery of hidden meanings which no Greek writer ever dreamed of, but more especially in the invention of nice distinctions between similar or even precisely equivalent expressions. A new era was introduced by Madvig, who has earned the lasting gratitude of scholars by his efforts to restore Greek syntax to the dominion of common sense. Madvig is fully justified in boasting that he was the first to give full and correct statements on such elementary matters as the meaning of the Aorist Optative and Infinitive, and the construction of 576 and is in oratio obliqua; although Professor Sophocles distinctly recognized the same principles in his Grammar, published later in the same year with Madvig's (1847). I can hardly express my great indebtedness to Madvig's Syntax der griechischen Sprache, and to his Bemerkungen über einige Puncte der griechischen Wortfügungslehre (in a supplement to the Philologus, Vol. II.). The works of this eminent scholar have aided me not only by the material which they have afforded as a basis for the present work, but also by the valuable suggestions with which they abound.

Next to Madvig, I must acknowledge my obligations to Krüger's Griechische Sprachlehre, which has everywhere supplied me with important details and most excellent examples. I have been frequently indebted to the other grammarians, who need not be specially mentioned. Bäumlein's Untersuchungen über die griechischen Modi reached me after the printing of the first edition was begun. I have often been indebted to his valuable collection of examples, and have derived many hints from his special criticisms; I regret that I cannot agree with the general principles to which he refers the uses of each mood, especially as his criticisms of the prevailing German theories on this subject are most satisfactory and instructive. I am indebted to the personal advice and suggestions of my learned colleague, Professor Sophocles, in the preparation of both editions, for information which no books could have supplied.

I must acknowledge the following special obligations. The notes on the tenses of the Indicative in Chapter II. are based mainly on Krüger, § 53. The chapters on the Infinitive and Participle are derived chiefly from Madvig's Syntax (Chapters V. and VI.), and partly from Krüger, § 55, § 56. The note on the Future Optative after onws, &c. (§ 26, Note 1) contains the substance of Madvig's Bemerkungen, pp. 27 - 29; and the account of the various constructions that follow verbs of hindrance and prevention (§ 95, 2 and 3) is based on the same work, pp. 47 - 66. The statement of the principles of indirect discourse (Chapter IV. Section IV.) was written in nearly its present form before Madvig's Syntax reached me; and I was strongly confirmed in the views there expressed, by finding that they agreed almost exactly with those of Madvig. I was anticipated by him in my statement of the occasional use of the Present Optative to represent the Imperfect, and in my quotation of DEM. in Onet. I. 869, 12 to illustrate it. I am entirely indebted to him, however, for the statement of the important principle explained in § 74, 2.

It remains to state what new material the present work professes to offer to scholars. The most important and most iv PREFACE.

radical innovation upon the ordinary system will be found in the classification of conditional sentences (§ 48), with its development in the rules that follow. I have explained the grounds of this classification at some length in the Proceedings of the American Academy, Vol. VI. p. 363, and will therefore merely allude to them here. The great difficulty (or rather the impossibility) of defining the force of the Subjunctive in protasis as distinguished from the Present Indicative, has arisen from neglect of the distinction between particular and general suppositions. When this is recognized, the distinction between the Subjunctive and the Present Indicative is seen to be entirely one of time; whereas all the common distinctions based on possibility, certainty, &c. will apply only to select examples. which of course are easily found to illustrate them. In the first edition, I could not persuade myself to abandon the old doctrines so completely as to exclude the common distinction between the Subjunctive and the Optative in protasis, - that the former implies a "prospect of decision," while the latter does not. Subsequent experience has convinced me that there is no more distinction between έὰν τοῦτο ποιή and εἰ τοῦτο ποιοίη than between the English if he shall do this and if he should do this; and I think every one must see that here there is no distinction but that of greater or less vividness of expression. The simple fact that both could be expressed by the Latin si hoc faciat is a strong support of this view.

The principles of conditional sentences being first settled, I have attempted to carry out the analogy between these and conditional relative sentences more completely. It seems to me that it is only by adopting the classification of conditional sentences which I have given, that the true nature of the analogous relative sentences can be made clear. (See § 60, § 61, § 62.) Upon a right classification of conditional sentences depends also the right understanding of the forms used to express a wish (§ 82, § 83).

The frequent use of the Subjunctive with $\tilde{\nu}a$, $\tilde{\delta}\pi\omega s$, &c., after past tenses, instead of the Optative, of which I had never seen a satisfactory explanation, is here explained on the principle of oratio obliqua. (See § 44, 2; § 77, 2.) The construction of the Infinitive with verbs like $\chi\rho\hat{\eta}\nu$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota$, forming

PREFACE.

an apodosis, is explained in the present edition on a new principle, which (it is hoped) will remove many of the difficulties which the old explanation did not reach. (See § 49, 2, Note 3 and Remarks.) In the first edition, the usual distinction between the constructions that follow où $\mu\dot{\eta}$ was adopted with hesitation, including Elmsley's punctuation, by which the second person of the Future in prohibitions with où $\mu\dot{\eta}$ is made interrogative. In this edition both constructions are explained more satisfactorily upon the same principle. (See § 89, 1 and 2, with Notes and Remarks.) It is hoped that the new statement of the force of the Perfect Infinitive, in § 18, 3, (a) and (b) of this edition, will meet the difficulties which that tense presents. The statement in the former edition was very defective.

It may seem strange to some that no general definitions of the Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative are attempted in the first chapter. I have rather taken warning from the numerous unsuccessful attempts that have been made to include all the uses of these moods in comprehensive definitions, and have preferred merely to illustrate their various uses by simple examples at the outset, leaving the explanations to their proper place in the book. For one, I am not ashamed to admit that I cannot propose a definition comprehensive enough to include all the examples in § 1, § 2, or § 3, which shall still be limited enough to be called a definition.

Besides the special changes already mentioned, the work has been subjected to a thorough revision, so that in many parts the new edition might claim to be an entirely new work.*

^{*} Notwithstanding the changes in the second edition, very few alterations have been made in numbering the paragraphs or notes. The following are the only changes (except a few omissions) which can affect references already made to the first edition: — § 18, 8 is subdivided into (a) and (b); § 18, 8, Rem. takes the place of § 18, 4, Note; § 24, Notes 1 and 2 are rearranged; § 37, Note 2 is omitted, and N. 3 is changed to N. 2; § 45, N. 2 is subdivided into (a) and (b); in § 49, 2, N. 3, the present divisions (c), (d), and (e) were included in (b); § 64, 1 and 2 are rearranged; in § 92, 2, Note 1 is changed to Remark; § 109, N. 9 was included in N. 3.

The following additions have been made in the second edition: — § 49, 2, N. 6 (b); § 50, 1, Rem. 2; § 52, 2, Rem.; § 53, N. 4; § 64, Rem. 2; § 65, 8, N. 2; § 65, 4; § 69, 5; § 71, Rem. 2; § 89, 2, Rem. 1 and 2; § 92, 2, N. 1; § 95, 3, Rem.; § 108, N. 4 (b); § 112, 1, Rem.; § 112, 2, Rem.; § 113, Rem. after N. 1C. The following have been materially changed in subject or in substance in the second edition: — § 25, 1, N. 5 (b); § 41, N. 4; § 43, Rem.; Remarks 1 and 2 after § 49, 2, N. 3; § 82, Rem. 2; § 89, 2, Notes 1 and 2.

Especially, the collection of examples has been revised and greatly enlarged, with the object of illustrating every variety of each construction from as wide a range of classic authors as possible. An index to these examples (more than 2,300 in number) is added to this edition. This index includes those which are merely cited, as well as those actually quoted, many of the former being quite as important as the latter. In the new edition, the matter printed in the two larger types has been reduced, and made as concise as was consistent with accuracy, while that printed in the smallest type has been greatly increased. It should be understood that only the firstmentioned portion of the work is intended for use as a grammatical text-book, while the notes and remarks in the smallest type are intended only for reference: with this view, the latter are often extended to a greater length than would otherwise be justifiable.

The Dramatists are cited by Dindorf's lines, except the fragments, which follow the numbers in Nauck's edition; Plato, by the pages of Stephanus; and Demosthenes, by Reiske's pages and lines. In the Index to the Examples, however, the sections of Bekker's German editions of Demosthenes have been added in each case, to facilitate reference. Other citations will be easily understood.

CAMBRIDGE, June, 1865.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE MOODS.

A. A. Tillia Can Managa	LIVE
§ 1. The five Moods §§ 2-4. Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative §§ 5-7. Imperative, Infinitive, Participle, and Verbal in -760s	1, 2 2, 3
CHAPTER II.	
USE OF THE TENSES.	
§ 8, 1. The seven Tenses 2. Primary and Secondary Tenses 9. Relative and absolute Time	3
Present and Imperfect.	
A. In the Indicative.	
§ 10, 1. Present Indicative	- 6 6
B. Present in the Dependent Moods.	
REM.—Distinction between Present and Aorist § 12. Present Subjunctive	9
§ 13, 1. Present Optative, not in indirect discourse 2. Present Optative in indirect discourse:— (a.) Representing a Present Indicative	10
(b.) Representing Pres. Subj. (in questions of doubt) § 14. Present Imperative	11 12
1. In its ordinary use (indefinite in time) 2. In indirect discourse 3. As Imperfect Infinitive	12 13 15
§ 16. Present Participle:— 1. As Present 2. As Imperfect	16 17
•	

Perfect and Pluperfect.

		A. In the Indicative.	
9	17,	 Perfect Indicative Pluperfect Indicative N. 2. Compound forms (εἰμί and ἦν with Perf. Part.) 	18 18
		B. Perfect in the Dependent Moods.	
g	18	Relations of the Perfect to the Present	19
2	10.	1. Perfect Subjunctive and Optative	20
		2. Perfect Imperative	21
		3. Perfect Infinitive	23
		4. Perfect Participle	23
		Aorist.	
		A. In the Indicative.	
2	19	Aorist Indicative	24
3	100	N. 2. Distinction between Aorist and Imperfect	24
		B. Aorist in the Dependent Moods.	
6	20.	Aorist Subjunctive	26
۰		N. 1. Aorist Subjunctive as Future Perfect 26,	27
§	21,	1. Aorist Optative not in indirect discourse	28
Ť		2. Aorist Optative in indirect discourse:—	
		(a.) Representing an Aorist Indicative	23
_		(b.) Representing an interrogative Aor. Subj	29
3	22.	Aorist Imperative	30
3	23.	Aorist Infinitive:	30
		1. In its ordinary use	37
		N. 2. After verbs of hoping, promising, &c.	32
8	24.	Aorist Participle	34
9		Ν. 1. With λανθάνω, φθάνω, &c.	34
		N. 2. With περιείδον, ἐπείδον, &c	35
		Future.	
§	25,	1. Future Indicative	36
		N. 5. Future with force of Imperative	37
		N. 6. Future denoting present intention	37
		2. Periphrastic Future (with $\mu \in \lambda \lambda \omega$)	85
3	26.	Future Optative . N. 1. After $\tilde{o}\pi\omega s$ and $\mu\dot{\eta}$	38
e	9.7	N. 1. After $\delta \pi \omega s$ and $\mu \dot{\eta}$	35
3	27.		41
		N. 1. Distinction between Future and Present or Aorist	41
		N. 2. Future used for Present or Aorist	
8	28.	Future Participle	48
8	29.	Future Perfect	40

CONTENTS.	13.
N. 3. Expressed by Perfect Participle and coopas N. 6. In the dependent moods	. 44
Gnomic and Iterative Tenses.	
 So, 1. Gnomic Aoris' and Perfect. N. 5. Gnomic Aorist in Infinitive and Participle N. 6. Gnomic Perfect in Infinitive 2. Iterative Imperfect and Aorist with αν NOTES. — Iterative Aorist in -σκον, -σκόμην. 	. 45 . 46, 47 . 47 . 47 . 47, 48
Dependence of Moods and Tenses.	
§ 31, 1-2. General Rules	. 48
§ 32. In the Indicative	49, 50
§ 33. In the Subjunctive and Imperative § 34. In the Optative	50 - 53
§ 35. In the Infinitive and Participle	. 53, 54
CHAPTER III.	
THE PARTICLE "AN.	
§ 36, 1-2. Two uses of \tilde{a}_{ν} . § 37, 1. " A_{ν} not used with the Present and Perfect Indicate 2. " A_{ν} with Future Indicative in early Poets N. 1. In Attic Greek (rare)	. 54 ive . 55 . 55
3. "Av with Secondary Tenses of the Indicative .	. 56
§ 38, 1. "Ay with the Subjunctive in Protasis, &c	. 56
2. "A ν with the Subjunctive in Apodosis (Epic) . § 39. "A ν with the Optative	. 57
§ 40. "Av not used with the Imperative	. 57
§ 41. "Av with the Infinitive and Participle 1. Present	57-61 58
2. Perfect	. 59
3. Aorist 4. Future 5 42, 1-4. Position and repetition of $\tilde{a}\nu$. 60 . 61-64
CHAPTER IV.	
USE OF THE MOODS.	
SECTION I.	
-	rese .
Final and Object Clauses after "Iva, "Ωs, "Oπ "Οφρα, and Mή.	,
§ 43. Classification	.65-67 .67

A. Pure Final Clauses.
 § 44, 1. Subjunctive and Optative after "va, ωs, ὅπωs, μή, &c. 67 N. 1. Future Indicative after ὅπωs, &c. N. 2 and 3. "Aν in Final Clauses 2. Subjunctive after secondary tenses 3. Secondary tenses of the Indicative after "va, &c. 72
B. Clauses with "Oπως and "Oπως μή after Verbs of Striving, &c.
 § 45. Future Indicative, &c. after ὅπως
C. Clauses with M'n after Verbs of $Fearing$, &c.
§ 46. Subjunctive and Optative after $\mu\dot{\eta}$
SECTION II.
CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.
\$ 47, 1. Protasis and Apodosis explained
I. Four Forms of Ordinary Conditional Sentences.
A. Present and Past Conditions.
 49, 1. Simple Indicative in Protasis and Apodosis N. 3. Future Indicative expressing present intention 2. Secondary tenses of the Indic. (cond. not fulfilled) N. 2. Omission of ἄν in Apodosis 96 N. 3. Verbs of necessity, &c. without ἄν, in Apod. 97-100 N. 6. Homeric Optative for Indicative 101, 102
B. Future Conditions.
 § 50, 1. Subjunctive with ἐάν in Protasis
II. Present and Past General Suppositions.
 Subjunctive and Optative in Protasis N. 3. Indicative after εί τις 109

	Ellipsis and Substitution	in Protasis or Apodosis.
§	§ 52, 1. Protasis implied in another Participle or other wor	er clause, or expressed in a
	N. 1 and 2. Ellinsis of Ve	rh of the Protesis 111 119
	2. Protasis suppressed .	
	N. Optative with αν like I	mperat. or Fut. Ind 113
9	§ 53. Apodosis expressed in Infini	tive or Participle 113
	 Protasis suppressed . N. Optative with αν like I Apodosis expressed in Infini Notes.—Ellipsis of the Ap 	odosis 114 – 116
	Mixed Construction	_
ş	§ 54, 1-3. Protasis and Apodosis § 55, 1. Two or more Protases wit	differing in form . 116-119
§	§ 55, 1. Two or more Protases wit	h the same Apodosis 119
	2. Apodosis in a dependent of 56. El after verbs expressing works.	construction 119
ş	\$ 56. Et after verbs expressing wor	ider, indignation, &c 120
3	§ 57. Δέ in Apodosis	121
	SECTIO	
	RELATIVE AND TEM	
§	§ 58, 1. Relative and Temporal W	ords
•	2. Definite and Indefinite Ar	itecedent 121, 122
	 § 58, 1. Relative and Temporal W 2. Definite and Indefinite An 3. Negative particles 	
	A. Relative with a I	
8	§ 59. Indicative after Relative wit	
ā	N. 1. Other constructions	
	B. Relative with an I	
§	§ 60, 1, 2. Conditional Relative exp 3. "Aν in Conditional Relative	dained 123-125
	3. "Av in Conditional Relative	e clauses 125
§	§ 61. Four forms of Conditional R	elative clauses correspond-
	ing to the four forms of ordi	nary protasis . 125 – 129
	1. Simple Indicative (like § 4	19, 1)
	2. Secondary tenses of the In	dicative (like § 49, 2) . 126
	5. Subjunctive (like § 50, 1)	nary protasis . 125 – 129 19, 1) 125 dicative (like § 49, 2) 126
2		
3	Subjunctive and Optat N. 1. Indicative in these s N. 3. Subjunctive in Hom § 63, 1. Relative without äv, with t 2, 3, 4. Peculiarities in Cond.	ive (like § 51) 129
	N. 1. Indicative in these se	entences (after ὅστις) . 131
	N. 3. Subjunctive in Hom-	eric similes 132
Ş	§ 63, 1. Relative without av, with	the Subjunctive 133
۰	2, 3, 4. Peculiarities in Cond.	Relative clauses . 133 - 135
	5. Parenthetical Relative clar	ises (ὅ τι ποτ' ἐστίν) . 135
	Assimilation in Condition	
Ş	§ 64, 1. Assimilation after Subjunc	tive or Optative 135
	§ 64, 1. Assimilation after Subjunct 2. Assimilation after secondar	cy tenses of Indicative . 136
	Relative Clauses expressi	
e	§ 65, 1. Future Indicative after R	
3	S and I'm I dome immediate arrest in	04004100

CONTENTS

	 N. 2. Subjunctive and Optative in Homer N. 5. Relative clauses expressing a result 2. Future Indicative after ἐφ' φ, ἐφ' φ̄τε 3. Indicative after κόστε 4. Causal Relative Sentences 	148 140 140 140 141
	Temporal Particles signifying Until and Befor that.	е
ş	 A. "Εως, "Εστε, "Αχρι, Μέχρι, Εἰσόκε, "Οφρα, Until. 66, 1. "Εως, &c. with past tenses of Indicative 2. "Εως ἄν, &c. with Subj. "Εως, &c. with Optative 142, 3. "Εως, &c. with secondary tenses of Indicative . 4. "Εως, &c. with Subj. and Opt. after general statements 	143
ş	 B. Πρίν, Until, Before that. 67. Finite Moods and Infinitive after πρίν . 1. Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative after πρίν . 2. Infinitive after πρίν (see § 106) . N. 3. Πρὶν ἥ, πρότερον ἥ, πρόσθεν ἥ . 	144 145 145 146
	SECTION IV.	
	Indirect Discourse.	
ş	68, 1. Direct and Indirect Quotations distinguished 2. Manner of introducing Indirect Quotations 3. Indirect Questions	147 147 147
	General Principles.	
Ş	 Secondary tenses of the Indicative Infinitive and Participle *Aν in Indirect Discourse 	148
	Indirect Quotation of Simple Sentences.	
§	 Indicative and Optative after ὅτι or ὡs, and in Indirect Questions: — 	
	 Indicative after primary tenses Optative or Indicative after secondary tenses Rem. 1 and 2. Both Moods in the same quotation. 151, N. 1. (a.) Imperfect and Pluperfect retained (b.) Present Optative as Imperfect N. 3. Independent Optative (often with γάρ) Interrogative Subjunctive in Indirect Questions. 154, Indicative or Optative with ἄν in Indirect Discourse. 	152
ş	 71. Interrogative Subjunctive in Indirect Questions 154, 	154
0	72. Indicative or Optative with $d\nu$ in Indirect Discourse .	156
9	73, 1. Infinitive, with or without av, in Indirect Discourse 2. Participle, with or without av, in Indirect Discourse	157

CONTENTS.

Indirect Quotation of Compound Sentences.	
N. 1. Mixed constructions	64 65
Single Dependent Clauses in Indirect Quotation.	
 § 77, 1. (a.) Clauses depending on an Infinitive after verbs of commanding, &c. — (b.) Causal sentences stating a cause assigned by others. — (c.) Clauses after εί or είων, in case that. — (d.) Relative and temporal clauses expressing a past intention. — (e.) Relative sentences containing the thought of another 1 2. Same principle applied to clauses after ἵνα, ὅπως, &c. 1 	166
"O and "O in Indirect Overations	
"Oπωs and "O in Indirect Quotations.	
§ 78, 1. 'Όπως for ὅτι οτ ὡς. 2. Homeric ὅ for ὅτι	.70 71
§ 79. On before Direct Quotations	.71
SECTION V.	
CAUSAL SENTENCES.	
§ 81, 1. Indicative in Causal sentences. 2. Optative after secondary tenses, to express a cause assigned by others. 1	71 71 72 73
SECTION VI.	
Expression of a Wish.	
REM.—Two classes of Wishes	76
SECTION VII.	
Imperative and Subjunctive in Commands, Exhor-	
TATIONS, AND PROHIBITIONS.	
§ 84. Imperative	

SECTION VIII.

4	SUBJUNCTIVE (LIKE FUT. IND.) IN INDEPENDENT SEA — Interrogative Subjunctive. — Οὐ μή WITH S TIVE AND FUTURE INDICATIVE.	UBJ	JNC-
e	87. Independent Subjunctive in Homer		181
3	Note. — With $\tilde{a}\nu$, in apodosis .	•	182
8	88. Interrogative Subjunctive (with or without βούλει)		182
Š	89. Double Negative, où un:—		
3	1. With Subj. (rarely Fut. Ind.), as emphatic Future		184
	2. With Future Indicative in prohibitions	•	185
	CHAPTER V.		
	THE INFINITIVE.		
ş	90. Infinitive as a Verbal Noun	•	188
ş	91. Infinitive as Subject	•	188
ş	92. Infinitive as Object:—		
	1. Not in indirect discourse	•	189
	2. In indirect discourse	•	192
_	N. 3. Infinitive after Relatives (by assimilation)	•	193
ş		19 3 –	
ş	94. Infinitive (with Article) after Prepositions	•	197
Ş	95, 1. Infinitive as Genitive or Dative	•	197
	2. Two constructions after verbs of hindrance, &c.	•	198
	N. 1. Negative particles. Double Negative, μη οὐ	•	200
	3. Infinitive with $\tau \delta \mu \dot{\eta}$, after expressions implying	pre-	
_	vention, omission, or denial	•	201
	96. Infinitive and its adjuncts preceded by 76.	•	202
9	97. Infinitive expressing a purpose	•	203
c	N. 4. Infin. after Comparative and η , than	•	204
3	98, 1. Infinitive after wore (result)	•	205
	 Infin. after ωστε (condition or purpose) N. 1. 'Ωs for ωστε, with Infinitive 	•	205
e	99. Infinitive after $\dot{\epsilon}\phi'$ $\dot{\phi}$ or $\dot{\epsilon}\phi'$ $\dot{\phi}\tau\epsilon$.	•	206
8	100. Absolute Infinitive (generally with we or ofor)	•	207
3	N 1 'Oliver (Soir) almost little short of	•	207
	N. 1. 'Ολίγου (δείν), almost, little short of	•	208
e	101 Infinitive used imperatively	•	208
Š	102 Infinitive in wishes (like the Ontative)	•	208 209
š	103. Infinitive in laws treaties proclamations &	•	
ŝ	104. Infinitive expressing surprise or indignation	•	209 209
ŝ	105. Infinitive in narration	•	210
Š	101. Infinitive used imperatively 102. Infinitive in wishes (like the Optative) 103. Infinitive in laws, treaties, proclamations, &c. 104. Infinitive expressing surprise or indignation 105. Infinitive in narration 106. Infinitive after $\pi\rho i\nu$	210,	
	Νοτες Πρὶν ή, πρότερον ή, πρόσθεν ή, πάρος .	210, 211,	
		~11,	

CHAPTER VI.

THE PARTICIPLE.

§ 107. Three uses of the Participle
§ 109. Partic. defining the circumstances of an action:
1-4. Time, means, manner, cause, &c
5-7. Purpose, condition, opposition, &c
Notes 1-5. Adverbs, &c. with Part. of § 109 . 218-221
N. 7. (a.) Partic in Rel. or Interrog. sentences . 221
(b.) Τί μαθών; Τί παθών; wherefore? 221, 225
§ 110, 1. Genitive Absolute
2. Accusative Absolute
§ 111. Gen. or Accus. Absol. and ordinary Partic. combined 223
§ 112. Participle with verbs (like Infinitive): —
1. With verbs signifying to begin, to cease, &c 226
2. With διατελέω, λανθάνω, τυγχάνω, φθάνω, &c 227
§ 113. Partic. in indirect discourse (after verbs signifying to see,
to perceive, to know, &c.)
N. 1. Participle with δηλός (φανερός) είμι 230
N. 6. Participle with σύνοιδα and συγγιγνώσκω 230
N. 10. Ωs with these Participles
•
CHAPTER VII.
VERBAL ADJECTIVES IN -Téos.
•
§ 114. Two constructions of the Verbal in $-\tau \acute{\epsilon}os$:—
1. Personal construction
2. Impersonal construction 233, 234
APPENDIX I
APPENDIX II
INDEX TO EXAMPLES
English Index
Greek Index

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE MOODS.

- § 1. The Greek verb has five Moods, the Indicative, Subjunctive, Optative, Imperative, and Infinitive. The first four, as opposed to the Infinitive, are called *finite* moods.
- § 2. The Indicative is used in simple, absolute assertions; as γράφει, he writes; ἔγραψεν, he wrote; γράψει, he will write; γέγραφεν, he has written.

The Indicative is used also to express various other relations, which the following examples will illustrate:—

Εἰ τοῦτο ἀληθές ἐστι, χαίρω, if this is true, I rejoice. Εὶ ἔγραψεν, ἢλθον ἄν, if he had written, I should have come. Εἰ τοῦτο ποιήσει, καλῶς ἔξει, if he shall do this, it will be well. Ἐπιμελεῖται ὅπως τοῦτο γενήσεται, he takes care that this shall happen. Εἴθε με ἔκτεινας, ώς μήποτε τοῦτο ἐποίησα, Ο that this killed me, that I might never have done this! Εἴθε τοῦτο ἀληθὲς ἦν, Ο that this were true. Λέγει ὡς τοῦτο ἀληθές ἐστιν, he says that this is true. Εἴπεν ὅτι τοῦτο πράξει, he said that he would do this. Ἐρωτᾶ τί ἐγράψαμεν, he asks what we wrote.

These constructions will be explained in Chapter IV. They are sufficient to show the impossibility of including all the uses of the Indicative in one definition. Any definition which is to include these must be comprehensive enough to include even the Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive in Latin; for $\epsilon i \ \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \psi \epsilon \nu$, $\delta \lambda \theta \nu \ \delta \nu$ is equivalent to si scripsisset, venissem. It would be equally impossible to give a single definition sufficiently precise to be of any use in practice, including all the uses of the Subjunctive or Optative.

§ 3. The various uses of the Subjunctive — in clauses denoting a purpose or object, after νa , $\mu \dot{\eta}$, &c.; m conditional, relative, and temporal sentences; and

in certain independent sentences — may be seen by the following examples: —

"Ερχεται ινα τοῦτο ι΄δη, he is coming that he may see this. Φοβείται μὴ τοῦτο γένηται, he fears lest this may happen. Ἐὰν τοῦτο ποιείν βούληται, δυνήσεται, if he shall wish to do this, he will be able. Το τὰν ποιείν βούληται δυνήσεται, whatever he shall wish to do he will be able (to do). Ἐάν τι ποιείν βούληται, τοῦτο ποιείν βιούληται wishes to do anything, he (aiways) does it. Το τι ᾶν ποιείν βιούληται ποιεί, whatever he wishes (at any time) to do he (always) does. Τοταν τοῦτο ποιείν βιούληται, δυνήσεται, when he shall wish to do this, he will be able. Τοταν ποιείν τι βιούληται, ποιεί, whenever he wishes to do anything, he (always) does it. Τι ωμεν, let us go. Μὴ θαν μάσητε, do not wonder. Οὖ μὴ τοῦτο γένηται, this will (surely) not happen. Τί εἴπω; what shall I say?

§ 4. The various uses of the Optative—in clauses denoting a purpose or object after $\tilde{l}\nu a$, $\mu \acute{\eta}$, &c.; in conditional, relative, and temporal sentences; in indirect quotations and questions; and in independent sentences (in apodosis with $\tilde{a}\nu$, or in expressions of a wish)—may be seen by the following examples:—

"Ήλθεν "να τοῦτο ἴδοι, he came that he might see this. Ἐφοβεῖτο μὴ τοῦτο γένοιτο, he feared lest this might happen. Εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖν βούλοιτο, δύναιτ' ἄν, if he should wish to do this, he would be able. "Ο τι ποιεῖν βούλοιτο δύναιτ' ἄν, whatever he should wish to do, he would be able (to do). Εἴ τι ποιεῖν βούλοιτο, τοῦτ' ἐποίει, if he would be able (to do anything, he (always) did it. "Ο τι ποιεῖν βούλοιτο ἐποίει, whatever he wished (at any time) to do he (always) did. "Οτε τοῦτο ποιεῖν βούλοιτο, δύναιτ' ἄν, whenever he should wish to do this, he would be able. "Ότε ποιεῖν τι βούλοιτο, ἐποίει, whenever he wished to do anything, he (always) did it. Εἶπεν ὅτι τοῦτο ποιοίη, he said that he was doing this. Εἶπεν ὅτι τοῦτο ποιήσει, he said that he would do this. Ἡρώτων τί ποιοίη (ποιήσειεν οτ ποιήσει), they asked what he was doing (had done, or would do).

Δύναιτ' αν τουτο ποιείν, he would be able to do this. Είθε μη ταυτα πάσχοιεν, O that they may not suffer these things! 'Απόλοιτο,

may he perish! Μή τοῦτο γένοιτο, may this not happen!

NOTE. For a discussion of the relation of the Optative to the Subjunctive, see Appendix.

- § 5. The Imperative is used to express a command, exhortation, entreaty, or prohibition.
 - § 6. The Infinitive expresses the simple idea of the

verb without restriction of person or number, and may be considered as a verbal noun with many attributes of a verb.

§ 7. To the Moods may be added the Participle, and the Verbal in -\(\tau\epsilon\) or -\(\tau\epsilon\) Both are verbal adjectives.

CHAPTER II.

USE OF THE TENSES.

- § 8. 1. There are seven Tenses,—the Present, Imperfect, Perfect, Pluperfect, Aorist, Future, and Future Perfect. The Imperfect and Pluperfect occur only in the Indicative; the Futures are wanting in the Subjunctive and Imperative.
- 2. These tenses are divided into primary and secondary; the primary tenses being those which refer to present or future time, and the secondary being those which refer to past time.

The primary tenses of the Indicative are the Present, Perfect, Future, and Future Perfect. The secondary tenses are the Imperfect, Pluperfect, and Aorist.

Note. This distinction will be more fully explained at the end of this chapter, $\S\S$ 31-35.

§ 9. In speaking of the time denoted by any verb, we must distinguish between time which is present, past, or future with reference to the time of the speaker or writer (that is, time absolutely present, &c.), and time which is present, past, or future with reference to the time of some other verb with which the verb in question is connected (that is, time relatively present, &c.). Thus, when we say τοῦτο ἀληθές ἐστιν, this is true, ἐστίν denotes time present with reference to the time of speak-

ing: but when we say ἔλεξε τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἶναι, or ἔλεξεν ὅπ τοῦτο ἀληθές ἐστιν (or εἴη), he said that this was true (1. e. he said "this is true"), we use the Present tense; but this tense here denotes time present with reference to the time of the leading verb, ἔλεξε, or time absolutely past and only relatively present. The same distinction is seen between the Future in τοῦτο γενήσεται, this will happen, and in ἔλεξε τοῦτο γενήσεσθαι οτ ὅτι γενήσεται (γενήσοιτο), he said that this would happen; where the Future in the first case denotes time absolutely future, in the other cases time only relatively future, which may even be absolutely past. Again, in τοῦτο ἐγένετο, this happened, the Aorist is absolutely past; but in ἔλεξε τοῦτο γενέσθαι, or ἔλεξεν ὅτι τοῦτο ἐγένετο (or γένοιτο), he said that this had happened, it denotes time past with reference to the time of ἔλεξεν, which makes it doubly past.

It is to be noticed as a special distinction between the Greek and English idioms, that the Greek oftener uses its tenses to denote merely relative time. Thus, in the examples given above, we translate the Greek Presents εἶναι and ἐστί after ἔλεξε by our Imperfect was; the Futures γενήσεσθαι and γενήσεται by would happen; and the Aorists γενέσθαι and ἐγένετο by had happened. This principle is especially observed in the Indicative, Optative, and Infinitive in indirect quotations; in final and object clauses after Γνα, ὅπως, &c.; and usually in the Participle.

PRESENT AND IMPERFECT.

A. In the Indicative.

§ 10. 1. The Present Indicative represents an action as going on now; as $\gamma\rho\dot{\alpha}\phi\omega$, I write, or I am writing.

REMARK. A single important exception occurs when the Present Indicative in indirect discourse denotes time present relatively to the leading verb. See above, § 9; and § 70, 2.

Note 1. As the limits of such an action on either side of the present moment are not defined, the Present may express a customary or repeated action, or a general truth. E. g. Πλοΐον εἰς Δῆλον ᾿Αθηναῖοι π έ μ π ο υ σ ι ν , the Athenians send a ship to Delos (every year). Plat. Phaed. 58 A. Τίκτει τοι κόρος ὕβριν, ὅταν κακῷ ὅλβος ἔπηται, satiety begets insolence, whenever prosperity follows the wicked. Theogn. 153. Ἐν χρόνῷ ἀποφθίνει τὸ τάρβος ἀνθρώποισιν. Aesch. Agam. 857.

Note 2. The Present denotes merely the continuance of an action, without reference to its completion: sometimes, however, it is directly implied by the context that the action is not to be completed, so that the Present denotes an attempted action. Especially, $\delta(\delta\omega\mu)$, in the sense I offer, and $\pi\epsilon(\delta\omega)$, I try to persuade, are used in this sense. E. g.

Νῦν δ' ἄμα τ' αὐτίκα πολλὰ διδοῖ, he offers many things. II. IX, 519. II είθου σι ὑμᾶς ἐναντία καὶ τοῖς νόμοις καὶ τῷ δικαίῷ ψηφίσασθαι, they are trying to persuade you to vote contrary both to the laws and to justice. ISAE. de Cleon. Hered. § 26.

This signification is much more common in the Imperfect. See § 11, N. 2, and the examples.

NOTE 3. The Present is often used with expressions denoting past time, especially $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda a_i$, in the sense of a Perfect and Present combined. E. g.

Κείνον ὶ χνε ψω πάλαι, I have been tracking him a long time (and still continue it). Soph. Aj. 20. Οὐ πάλαι σοι λέγω ὅτι ταὐτόν φημι εἶναι; i. e. have I not long ago told you, (and do I not still repeat,) that I call it the same thing? Plat. Gorg. 489 C. So Πολύν χρόνον τοῦτο ποιῶ.

So in Latin, Jam dudum loquor.

Note 4. The Presents ήκω, I am come, and οἴχομαι, I am gone, are used in the sense of the Perfect. An approach to the signification of the Perfect is sometimes found in such Presents as φεύγω, in the sense I am banished, ἀλίσκομαι, I am captured, νικάω and κρατέω, I am victorious, ἡττάομαι, I am conquered, ἀδικέω, I have been unjust (I am ἄ δ ι κ ο s). So ἵκω and ἰκάνω in Homer, with ὅλλυμαι and similar verbs and sometimes τίκτω in the Tragedians. E. g.

Θεμιστοκλῆς ῆκω παρὰ σέ, I, Themistocles, am come to thee. Thuc. I, 137. Οἴχεται εἰς ἄλα δῖαν, he is gone to the divine sea Π . XV, 223. Ἰλίου άλισκομένου, Ilium having been captured. Thuc. VI, 2. So Hdt. I, 85. Εἰ πάντα ταῦτα ἐλυμαίνετο τοῖς ὅλοις, ἔως ἀνέτρεψε, τί Δημοσθένης ἀδικεῖ; DEM. Cor. 327, 1. Πύργων ὀλλυ μένων ἐνὶ ναυσὶν ἔβαν, I embarked after the towers had been destroyed. Eur. Iph. T. 1108. So ἀνοιγομένης θύρης, Hdt. I, 9 "Ηδε τίκτει σε, this woman is thy mother. Eur. Ion. 1560.

Note 5. The Greek, like other languages, often allows the use of the Present of such verbs as *I hear*, *I learn*, *I say*, even when their action is strictly finished before the moment at which they are used. E. g.

Οἱ Σικελιώται στασιάζουσιν, ὡς πυνθανόμεθα, the Sicilians are at discord, as we learn. ΤΗυς. VI, 16. Ἐπὶ πόλεις, ὡς ἐγὼ ἀκοῆ αἰσθάνομαι, μέλλομεν ἰέναι μεγάλας. ΤΗυς. VI, 20.

Note 6. The Present $\epsilon l\mu$, I am going, through all its moods, is used like a Future. Its compounds are sometimes used in the same sense. (The Poets, especially Homer, sometimes use $\epsilon l\mu$ as a Present.) E. g.

Σεῦ ὖστερος εἶμ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν, I shall go. Π. XVIII, 333. Εἶμι πάλιν επ' ἐκεῖνα, I shall recur to that. Plat. Phaed. 100 B. 'Αλλ' εἴσειμι, σοῦ δ' οὐ φροντιῶ. ARIST. Nub. 125. ⁹Ω φίλ', ἐγὼ μὲν ἄπειμι, σύας καὶ κεῖνα ψυλάξων. Od. XVII, 593.

(As Present.) Οίος δ' ἀστήρ είσι μετ' ἀστράσι νυκτὸς ἀμολγώ,

as a star moves, &c. Il. XXII, 317.

Note 7. In animated language the Present often refers to the future, to express likelihood, intention, or danger. E. g.

Μένομεν ἔως ἃν ἕκαστοι κατὰ πόλεις ληφθῶμεν; shall we wait! Thuc. VI. 77. Εἰ δέ φησιν οὖτος, δειξάτω, κάγὰ καταβαίνω, and I will take any seat. Dem. F. L. 351, 4. Σὶ εἰ δ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἔτερον προσδοκῶμεν; art thou he that should come, or do we look for another? Matth. Evang. XI, 3. ᾿Απόλλυμαι, I shall perish. (See § 17, N. 6.)

2. The Present is often used in narration for the Aorist, to give a more lively statement of a past event. This is called the Historic Present. E. g.

Βουλήν ἐπιτεχνῶται ὅπως μὴ άλισθεῖεν ᾿Αθηναῖοι, he contrives a plan to prevent the Athenians from collecting. Hdt. I, 63. Κελεύει πέμψαι ἄνδρας · . . . ἀποστέλλουσιν οὖν, καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν ὁ Θημιστοκλῆς κρύφα πέμπει. Thuc. I, 91. Δαρείου καὶ Παρυσάτιδος παῖδες γίγνονται δύο. ΧΕΝ. An. I, 1, 1.

Note. The Historic Present is not found in Homer.

§ 11. The Imperfect represents an action as going on in past time; as εγραφον, I was writing.

NOTE 1. The Imperfect is thus a Present transferred to the past, and it retains all the peculiarities of the Present

which are not inconsistent with the change to past time. Thus the Imperfect denotes customary or repeated action, as opposed to the Aorist, which denotes the simple occurrence of an action. (See § 19, N. 2.) E. g.

'Επὶ Κέκροπος ἡ Αττικὴ κατὰ πόλεις ῷκεῖτο, καὶ οὐ ξυνήεσαν βουλευσόμενοι. ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ ἔκαστοι ἐπολιτεύοντο καὶ ἐβουλεύοντο. Έπειδὴ δὲ Θησεύς ὲβασίλευσεν, ἐς τὴν νῦν πόλιν οὖσαν ξυνῷκισε πάντας. ΤΗυς. Π , 15. (Here the Imperfects refer to the state of the country or the customs, the Aorists to single actions; ἐβασίλευσε, became king, ξυνῷκισε, collected into one state.)

Note 2. The Imperfect, like the Present (§ 10, N. 2), sometimes denotes attempted action, being in this case strictly an Imperfect tense. So especially ἐδίδουν and ἔπειθον. E. g.

Φίλιππος 'Αλόννησον ἐδίδον, Philip offered Halonnesus (lit. tried to. give it). Aesch. Cor. § 83. Έκαστος ἔπειθεν αὐτὸν ὑποστῆναι τὴν ἀρχήν, each one tried to persuade him to undertake the command. Xen. An. VI, 1, 19. Κῦμα ἴστατ' ἀειρόμενον, κατὰ δ' ἢ ρεε Πηλείωνα, and was about to overpower the son of Peleus. Π. XXI, 327. Έμισθοῦνο παρ' οὐκ ἐκδιδόντος τὴν αὐλήν, he tried to hire the yard of one who refused to let it. Hdt. I, 68. Πέμψαντες ἐς Σάρδις χρυσὸν ἀνέοντο, they wanted to buy gold. Hdt. I, 69. Ἐπεθύμησε τῆς χλαιδος, καὶ αὐτὴν προσελθών ἀνέετο, he tried to buy it. Hdt. III, 139. Α ἐπράσσετο οὐκ ἐγένετο, what was attempted did not happen. Thuc. VI, 74. So προσετίθει, she wanted to add. Arist. Nub. 63.

Note 3. When the Present has the force of the Perfect (§ 10, 1, N. 4), the Imperfect has regularly the force of a Pluperfect. (See § 17, N. 3). E. g.

'O ὅχλος κατὰ θέαν ἡ κεν, the crowd were come to look on. Thuc. VI, 31. Ἐπεὶ ῷ χεο νηὶ Πύλονδε, after thou wast gone by ship to Pylos. Od. XVI, 24.

Note 4. The Imperfect sometimes denotes likelihood, intention, or danger in past time. (See § 10, 1, N. 7.) E. g.

'Επειδή τῷ ψεύδεσθαι ἀπώλλυτο, when he was on the point of ruin through his deceit. ANTIPHON. de Caed. Herod. § 37. Καὶ τἄμ' ἔθνησκε τέκι', ἀπωλλύμην δ' ἐγώ, and my children were about to die, and I was about to perish. Eur. Herc. F. 538.

Note 5. The Imperfect is sometimes found in simple narration, where the Aorist would be expected, especially in Homer. The meaning of the verb often makes it indifferent which of the two is used. Thus $\beta \hat{a} \hat{\nu} \nu \nu$ and $\beta \hat{\eta}$ are used without any perceptible difference in Il. I, 437, 439; so $\beta \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau \sigma$ and $\beta \hat{a} \lambda \epsilon \tau \sigma$, II, 43, 45; $\theta \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \nu$ and $\tau i \theta \epsilon \iota$, XXIII. 653, 656; $\delta \hat{\omega} \kappa \epsilon$ and $\delta i \delta \nu$, VII, 303, 305; $\delta \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon \nu$ and $\lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota} \pi \epsilon$, II, 106, 107; compare also $\mu \iota \sigma \tau \nu \lambda \nu \nu$ and $\delta \pi \tau \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$, I, 465, 466.

Herodotus and Thucydides use ἔλεγον and ἐκέλευον as Aorists. Compare ἔλεγον, Thuc. I, 72, with εἶπον and ἔλεξε, I, 79.

NOTE 6. The Imperfect sometimes expresses a fact, which is either the result of a previous discussion, or one that is just recognized as a fact by the speaker or writer, having previously been denied, overlooked, or misunderstood. In the latter case, the particle apa is often joined to the verb. E. g.

 $^{\circ}$ Ω πόποι, οὐκ ἄρα πάντα νοήμονες οὐδὲ δίκαιοι ἢ σ αν Φαίγκων ἡγήτορες ἠδὲ μέδοντες, i. e. they are not, as I once imagined. Od. XIII, 209. Οὐκ ἄρα μοῦνον ἔην ἐρίδων γένος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν εἰσὶ δύω, there is not after all merely one race of discords, but there are two on earth. Hes. Op. 1. $^{\circ}$ Οδὶ ἢ ν ἄρα ὁ ξυλλαβών με, this is then the one who seized me. Soph. Phil. 978. Οὐ σὺ μόνος ἄρ' ἢ σθ' ἔποψ; are you not then the only epops (as I thought)? Arist. Av. 280. Ήν $^{\circ}$ μουσικὴ ἀντίστροφος τῆς γυμναστικῆς, εἰ μέρνησαι, music then (as we proved) corresponds to gymnastics. Plat. Rep. VII, 522 A. Διαφθεροῦμεν ἐκεῖνο, δ τῷ μὲν δικαίω βέλτιον ἐγίγνετο, τῷ δὲ ἀδίκω ἀ π ω λ λ υ τ ο, we shall destroy that which (as we proved) becomes better by justice and is ruined by injustice. Plat. Crit. 47 D. Åρ' οὐ τόδε ἢν τὸ δένδρον, ἐφ' ὅπερ ἢγες ἡμᾶς; is not this after all the tree to which you were bringing us? Plat. Phaedr. 230 A.

Note 7. The Greek sometimes uses an idiom like the English he was the one who did it for he is the one who did it; as ἢν ὁ τὴν γνώμην ταύτην εἰπὼν Πείσανδρος. ΤΗUC. VIII, 68; τίς ἢν ὁ βοηθήσας τοῖς Βυζαντίοις καὶ σώσας αὐτούς; DEM. Cor. 255, 2. (See Note 6.)

B. The Present in the Dependent Moods.

REMARK. The distinction of time which marks the Present and Aorist in the Indicative is retained in the Optative and Infinitive of indirect discourse, and usually in the Participles.

But in all other constructions, this distinction of time disappears in the dependent moods, and the Present and Aorist differ only in this, that the Present denotes a continued or repeated action, while the Aorist denotes the simple occurrence of an action, the time being determined by the construction. In these cases the Present and Aorist are the tenses chiefly used; the Perfect is seldom required (§ 18, 1, N.), and the Future is exceptional (§ 27, Notes). It must be remembered that the Greek distinction between the Present and Aorist in the Subjunctive and Optative is one which the Latin could not express; the Present, for example, being the only form found in the Latin Subjunctive to express a condition which the Greek can express by the Present or Aorist Optative, and sometimes by the Present or Aorist Subjunctive, each with some

peculiar meaning. Thus ϵi $\tau o \hat{\nu} \tau o$ $\tau o \iota o i \eta$, if he should do this (habitually), ϵi $\pi o \iota \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \epsilon$, (simply) if he should do this, and sometimes $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau o \hat{\nu} \tau o \tau o \iota \dot{\eta}$ (or $\pi o \iota \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta$), if he (ever) does this, may each be translated by si hoc faciat.

This distinction, although in general strictly observed, was sometimes neglected even by the best authors: we occasionally find, for example, the Present Subjunctive where the Aorist would have expressed the idea more exactly, and vice versa. In other examples the two seem to be used in nearly the same sense. (See Xen. Cyr. V, 5, 13.) These are to be considered merely as exceptions; when, however, the Aorist is wanting, as in $\epsilon l\mu l$, the Present regularly takes the place of both.

- § 12. The Present Subjunctive denotes a continued or repeated action, the time of which is determined as follows:—
- (a.) In clauses denoting a purpose after νa , $\delta \pi \omega s$, &c., or the object of fear after $\mu \eta$, it refers to time future relatively to that of the leading verb.
- (b.) In conditional sentences, in ordinary protasis (§ 50, 1), the Subjunctive refers simply to the future; if the supposition is *general* (depending on a verb of *present* time which expresses a repeated action or a general truth), the Subjunctive is indefinite in its time, but is expressed in English by the Present. This applies also to all conditional relative and temporal sentences.
- (c.) In independent sentences (in exhortations, prohibitions, questions of doubt, &c.) the Subjunctive refers to the future. E. g.
- (a.) Δοκεί μοι κατακαῦσαι τὰς ἀμάξας, ἵνα μὴ τὰ ζεύγη ἡμῶν στρατηγ ŷ, ἀλλὰ πορενώμεθα ὅπη ἀν τŷ στρατιῷ συμφέρη, it seems good to me to burn the wagons, that our beasts of burden may not be our generals, and that we may go on whithersoever it may be best for the army. Xen. An. III, 2, 27. Καὶ γὰρ βασιλεὺς αἰρεῖται, οὐχ ἵνα ξαυτοῦ καλῶς ἐπιμελῆται, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ οἱ ἐλόμενοι δι' αὐτὸν εὖ πράττωσι. Xen. Mem. III, 2, 3.
- (b.) *Αν δέ τις ἀνθιστῆται, πειρασόμεθα χειροῦσθαι, but if any one shall stand opposed to us, we will try to subdue him. Xen An

- VII, 3, 11. Κὰν πόλεμος ἢ, ἔως ἀν ἐπ' αλλον ἔχ ωμεν στρατεύεσθαι, σοῦ τε καὶ τῶν σῶν ἀφεξόμεθα, and if there shall be war, so long as we shall be able, &c. Id. Hell. IV, 1, 38. 'λλλ' ἢ ᾶν γιγνώσκω βέλτιστα ἐρῶ, but I will speak as I shall think best. ΤΗυΟ. VI, 9. Οὖς ἀναθον τι λέγε περὶ αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀπαγγέλλοντας, whomsoever you shall wish, &c. Isoc. Demon. p. 9 C. § 33. 'Απας λόγος, ἀν ἀπἢ τὰ πράγματα, μάταιόν τι φαίνεται καὶ κενάν, all speech, if (wherever) drads are wanting, appears vain and useless. DEM. Ol. II, 21, 20. Συμμαχεῖν τούτοις ἐθέλουσιν ἄπαντες, οὖς ἀν ὁ ρῶσι παρεσκευασμένους, all are willing to be allied to those whom they see prepared. Id. Phil. I, 42, 1.
- (c.) Πειθώμεθα πάντες· φεύγωμεν σύν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαΐαν, let us all be persuaded; let us fly, &c. Π. Π, 139. Τί φῶ; τί δρῶ; what shall I say? what shall I do? Πῶς οὖν περὶ τούτων ποιῶμεν; how then shall we act about this? Plat. Phileb. 63 A.

See other examples under the rules in Chapter IV.

- § 13. 1. The Present Optative, when it is not in indirect discourse, denotes a *continued* or *repeated* action, the time of which is determined as follows:—
- (a.) In clauses denoting a purpose after $\tilde{\nu}a$, $\delta\pi\omega$ s, &c., or the object of fear after $\mu\dot{\eta}$, it refers to time future relatively to that of the leading verb.
- (b.) In conditional sentences,—in ordinary protasis (§ 50, 2), the Optative refers to the future (only more vaguely than the Subjunctive); if the supposition is general (depending on a verb of past time which expresses a repeated action or general truth), the Optative refers to indefinite past time. This applies also to all conditional relative and temporal sentences.
- (c.) In independent sentences (that is, in expressions of a wish, and in Apodosis with $\tilde{a}\nu$) the Optative refers to the *future*. E. g.
- (a.) Τούτου ἐπεθύμει, ἴνα εὖ πράττοι, he desired this in order that he might be in prosperity. Ἐφοβεῖτο μὴ τοῦτο ποιοῖεν, he feared lest they should do this (habitually). Δήλος ἢν ἐπιθυμῶν ἄρχειν, ὅπως πλείω λαμβάνοι, ἐπιθυμῶν δὲ τιμᾶσθαι, ἵνα πλείω κερδαίνοι φίλος τε ἐβούλετο εἶναι τοῖς μέγιστα δυναμένοις, ἵνα ἀδικῶν μὴ διδοίη δίκην. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙ, 6, 21. (Here the Aorist Optative would have referred to single acts of receiving, getting gain, and suffering punishment, while the present refers to a succession of cases, and to a whole course of conduct.)

- (b.) Où yàp ân ê π airo (η με, εὶ ễ ξελαύνοιμι τοὺς εὐεργέτας, for he would not praise me, if I should banish my benefactors. Xen. An. VII, 7,11. Εἴης φορητὸς οὐκ ᾶν, εἰ π ράσσοις καλῶς, you would not be endurable, if you should be in prosperity (at any time). Aesch. Prom. 979. Hῶς γὰρ ἄν τις, ἄ γε μὴ ἐπίσταιτο, ταῦτα σοφὸς εἴη; for how could any one be wise in that which he did not understand $^{\circ}$ (i. e. εἴ τινα μὴ ἐπίσταιτο.) Xen. Mem. IV, 6, 7. ᾿Αλλ εἴ τι μὴ Φέροιμεν, ὧτρυνεν φέρειν, but if we neglected to bring anything, he always exhirted us to bring it. Eur. Alc. 755. Οὐκ ἀπελείπετο ἔτι αὐτοῦ, εἰ μή τι ἀναγκαῖον εἶη, he never left him, unless there was some necessity for it. Xen. Mem. IV, 2, 40. ὑπότε Εὐαγόραν ὁρῷεν, ἐφαβοῦντο, whenever they saw Evagoras, they were afraid. Isoc. Evag. 193 D. § 24.
- (c.) Eibe τοῦτο εἴη (utinam sit), O that this may be. Εἴθε μὴ ταῦτα πάσχοιεν, may they not suffer these things (habit tally). But εἴθε μὴ πάθοιεν, may they not suffer (in a single case). See examples of Apodosis with ἄν above, under (b).

See other examples under the rules in Chapter IV.

- 2. In indirect quotations and questions, each tense of the Optative denotes the same time, *relatively* to the leading verb, which the tense (of any mood) which it represents denoted in the direct discourse. (See § 69, 1.)
- (a.) If therefore the Present Optative represents a Present Indicative of the direct discourse, it denotes a continued or repeated action, contemporary with that of the leading verb (that is, relatively present). E. g.

Περικλής προηγόρευε, ὅτι 'Αρχίδαμός οἱ ξένος εἴη, Pericles announced that Archidamus was his friend (i. e. he said ξένος μοὶ ἐστιν). ΤΗυς. Π, 13. "Εγνωσαν ὅτι κενὸς ὁ φόβος εἴη, they learned that their fear was groundless (i. e. they learned κενός ἐστιν). ΧΕΝ. ΑΝ. Π, 2, 21. 'Επυνθάνετο εἰ οἰκοῖτο ἡ χώρα, he asked whether the country was inhabited (i. e. he asked the question, Is the country inhabited?). ΧΕΝ. Cyr. IV, 4, 4.

(b.) But if it represents a Present Subjunctive of the direct discourse, it denotes a continued or repeated action, which is *future* with reference to the leading verb. E. g.

Kλέαρχος ἐβουλεύετο, εἶ πέμποιέν τινας ἢ πάντες ἴοιεν, Clearchus was deliberating whether they should send a few, or should all go. Xen. An. I. 10, 5. (The question was, πέμπωμέν τινας ἢ πάντες ἴωμεν; shall we send a few, or shall we all go? See § 88.)

REMARK. Examples of the Present Optative representing the

Present Irdicative or Subjunctive in a dependent clause of the direct discourse, to which the same principles apply, may be found under § 74, 1.

Note 1. It will be seen, by a comparison of the examples under (a) and (b), that an ambiguity may sometimes arise from uncertainty whether the Optative stands for the Present Indicative or for the Present Subjunctive in a question of doubt (§ 88). Thus ἢγνόουν ὅ τι ποιοῦεν might mean they knew not what they were doing (the Optative representing τί ποιοῦμεν; what are we doing?) or they knew not what to do (the Optative representing τί ποιοῦμεν; what shall we do?). The context must decide in each case. See § 71.

NOTE 2. In the few instances in which the Present Optative in indirect quotations represents the *Imperfect* of the direct discourse, it of course denotes time *past* relatively to the leading verb. See § 70, 2, N. 1 (b).

- § 14. The Present Imperative refers to a continued or repeated action in future time; as $\phi \in \hat{\nu} \gamma \epsilon$, begone; $\chi \alpha \nu \rho \nu \nu \nu \nu$, let them rejoice; $\mu \hat{\gamma} \nu \rho \mu \nu \nu \nu \nu$, do not believe.
- § 15. The Present Infinitive has three distinct uses:—
- 1. First, in its ordinary use (either with or without the article), whenever it is not in indirect discourse, it denotes a continued or repeated action without regard to time, unless its time is specially defined by the context. E. g.

"Έξεστι μένειν, it is possible to remain. 'Εξέσται τοῦτο ποιεῖν, it will be possible to do this. Δέομαι ὑμῶν μένειν, I beg you to remain. Τὶ τὸ κωλῦον ἔτ' αὐτὸν ἔσται βαδίζειν ὅποι βούλεται, what will there be to prevent him from going whither he pleases? DEM. Ol. I, 12, 22. Ἐκέλευσα αὐτὸν τοῦτο ποιεῖν, I commanded him to do this. 'Εβούλετο σοφὸς εἶναι, he wished to be wise. Δεινός ἐστι λέγειν, he is skilled in speaking. 'Ώρα βαδίζειν, it is time to be going. Πῶν ποιοῦσιν, ὅστε δίκην μὴ διδόναι, they do everything, so as to avoid being punished. Plat. Gorg. 479 C. Τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐπιτιμᾶν ἴσως φήσαι τις ᾶν ῥάδιον εἶναι, τὸ δ' ὅ τι δεῖ πράττειν ἀπο φαίνεσθαι, τοῦτ' εἶναι συμβούλου, some one may say that finding fault is easy, but that showing what ought to be done is the duty of an adviser. DEM. Ol. I, 13, 27. (Here ἐπιτιμᾶν, ἀποφαίνεσθαι, and πράττειν belong under this rule; εἶναι in both cases belongs under § 15, 2.) Οὐ πλεο

νεξίας ἔνεκεν ταῦτ' ἔπραξεν, ἀλλὰ τῷ δικαιότερα τοὺς Θηβαίους ἡ ὑμας ἀξιοῦν, he did this not from love of gain, but because of the Thebans making juster demands than you. Dem. Phil. II, 69, 6. 'Ετειχίσθη δὲ 'Αταλάντη νῆσος, τοῦ μὴ ληστὰς κακουργεῖν τὴν Εὔβοιαν, in order to prevent pirates from ravaging Euboea. Thuc. II, 32.

REMARK. The Infinitive in this its ordinary use has usually no more reference to time than any verbal noun, and the distinction of tense therefore disappears, the Present differing from the Aorist only by expressing a continued or repeated action. An Infinitive which in itself has no reference to time may, however, be referred to some particular time, like any other verbal noun, by the verb on which it depends, by some particle like ωστε or πρίν, or by some other word in the sentence. Thus wore denoting a purpose refers the Infinitive to the future: the Infinitive without ωστε expressing a purpose is likewise future. After a large class of verbs, as those of commanding, advising, desiring, asking, &c., whose signification points to the future, the Infinitive necessarily denotes relative future time. (For an irregular use of the Future Infinitive after such verbs, see § 27, N. 2.) The time denoted by the Infinitive in any of these constructions must be carefully distinguished from that which it denotes in indirect discourse (§ 15, 2), where its tense is fully preserved.

- NOTE 1. For a discussion of the Infinitive with the article and a subject, with reference to its time, see Appendix, II.
- Note 2. $X\rho d\omega$, $dva\iota \rho \dot{\epsilon}\omega$, $\theta \dot{\epsilon}\sigma\pi \dot{\epsilon}\dot{\zeta}\omega$, and other verbs signifying to give an oracular response, are sometimes followed by the Present (as well as the Aorist) Infinitive, where we might expect the Future on the principle of indirect discourse (§ 15, 2, N. 1). These verbs here take the ordinary construction of verbs of commanding, advising, and warning. E. g.

Λέγεται δὲ ᾿Αλκμαίωνι τὸν ᾿Απόλλω ταύτην τὴν γῆν χρῆσαι οἰκεῖν, it is said that Apollo gave a response to Alcmaeon that he should inhabit this land. Thuc. Π , 102. The Future is sometimes found. For the Aorist, see § 23, 1, N. 2.

2. Secondly, the Present Infinitive in indirect discourse is used to represent a Present Indicative of the direct discourse, and therefore denotes a continued or repeated action, which is *contemporary* with that of the leading verb, that is, *relatively* present. E. g.

Φησὶ γράφειν, he says that he is writing; ἔφη γράφειν, he said that he was writing (i. e. he said "I am writing"); φήσει γράφειν, he will say that he is (then) writing. ᾿Αρρωστεῖν προφασίζεται, he pretends that he is sick. Ἐξώμοσεν ἀρρωστεῖν τουτονί, he took his oath that this man was sick. Ďem. F. L. 379, 15 and 17. Οὐκ ἔφη αἰτὸς ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνον στρατηγεῖν, he saia that not he himself, but Nicias;

was general; i. e. he said, οὐκ ἐγὼ αὐτὸς ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος στρατηγεῖ Tuuc. IV; 28. For the Present Infinitive with ἄν (not included here), see § 41.

Note 1. The Infinitive is said to stand in indirect discourse, with its tenses thus corresponding to the same tenses of the Indicative, only when it depends upon verbs implying thought or the expression of thought (verba sentiendi et declarandi), and when also the thought, as originally conceived, would have been expressed by some tense of the Indicative, which the corresponding tense of the Infinitive can represent. Thus verbs of commanding, wishing, and others enumerated in § 92, 1, although they may imply thought, yet never introduce an indirect quotation in the sense here intended, as an Infinitive after them never stands for an Indicative, but is merely the ordinary Infinitive used as a verbal noun, without any definite time. See § 73, 1, Remark; where the principle is stated in full, so as to include all the tenses and the Infinitive with \(\vec{a}\nu\).

NOTE 2. Verbs and expressions signifying to hope, to expect, to promise, and the like, after which the Future Infinitive stands regularly in indirect discourse (as representing a Future Indicative of the direct discourse), sometimes take the Present or the Aorist Infinitive. E. g.

'Ωμολόγεις καθ' ήμῶς πολιτεύεσθαι, you agreed to live according to us (the laws). Plat. Crit. 52 C. Συνέθου πολιτεύεσθαι. Id. 52 D. Προσαγαγῶν ἐγγυητὰς ἢ μὴν πορεύεσθαι, having giving securities that he would go. Xen. Cyr. VI, 2, 39. 'Ελπίζει δυνατὸς εἶναι ἄρχειν, he hopes to be able to rule. Plat. Rep. IX, 573 C. (But in Hdt. I, 30, ἐλπίζων εἶναι ὀλβιώτατος ἐπειρώτα, means, he asked, trusting that he was, εἶναι being a regular Present Infinitive of indirect discourse. So I. 22, ἐλπίζων εἶναι καὶ τὸν λεὼν τετρύσθαι.)

In these cases the Infinitive seems to be used nearly as in § 15, 1, without regard to time. The Greek makes no more distinction than the English between $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\pi i \zeta\epsilon\iota$ $\tau o \hat{\nu}\tau o \pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, he hopes to do this, and $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\pi i \zeta\epsilon\iota$ $\tau o \hat{\nu}\tau o \pi o \iota \dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$, he hopes that he shall do this. Compare $\phi a \mu \dot{\nu} \tau o \hat{\nu}\tau o \nu \dot{\omega} \mu o \lambda o \gamma \eta \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \nu a \tau a \tau o \iota \dot{\eta}\sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ with $\phi \dot{\alpha}\sigma \kappa o \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\alpha} \iota$. Plat. Crit. 51 E and 52 D. The Future, however, is the regular form (§ 27, N. 3). For the Aorist, see § 23, 2. N. 2.

NOTE 3. Even verbs of saying and thinking, — as λέγω, when it signifies to command, and δοκεί, it seems good, — may be followed by the ordinary Infinitive of § 15, 1, referring to the future. Εἶπον is very seldom followed by the Infinitive, except when it signifies to command. (See § 92, 2, N. 1.) The context must distinguish these cases from indirect quotations. E. g.

Τούτοις ἔλεγον πλείν, I told them to sail. DEM. F. L. 388, 4. (Τούτους ἔλεγον πλείν would mean I said that they were sailing.) Είπων μηδένα παριέναι εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, having given orders that no

one should pass into the citadel. Xen. Hell. V, 2, 29. Δοκεί ήμῶν τοῦτο ποιεῦν, it pleases us to do this. (But δοκεῖ μοι ὑμῶν τοῦτο ποιεῦν means it seems to me that you are doing this, by § 15, 2.) Τεδοξε in the sense it was resolved, introducing a resolution or enactment, is followed by the Present or Aorist (not Future) Infinitive.

3. Thirdly, the Present Infinitive belongs also to the *Imperfect*, and is used in indirect discourse to represent an Imperfect Indicative of the direct discourse. It here denotes continued or repeated action which is *past* with reference to the leading verb, thus supplying the want of an Imperfect Infinitive. E. g.

Τίνας οὖν εὐχὰς ὑπολαμβάνετ' εὔχεσθαι τὸν Φίλιππον ὅτ' ἔσπενdev; what prayers then do you suppose Philip made when he was pouring the libations? DEM. F. L. 381, 10. (Here the temporal clause οτ' έσπενδεν shows the past time denoted by εύχεσθαι.) Πότερ' οιεσθε πλέον Φωκέας Θηβαίων ή Φίλιππον ύμων κρατειν τώ πολέμω; do you think that the superiority of the Phocians over the Thebans, or that of Philip over you, was the greater in the war (the war being then past)? DEM. F. L. 387, 6. (Here the direct discourse would be εκράτουν and εκράτει.) Πως γὰρ οἴεσθε δυσχερως ἀκούειν 'Ολυνθίους, εί τίς τι λέγοι κατά Φιλίππου κατ' έκείνους τους χρόνους, ὅτ' 'Ανθεμούντα αὐτοίς ἀφίει, κ. τ. λ.; ἄρα προσδοκάν αὐτούς τοιαῦτα πείσεσθαι (sc. οἴεσθε); ἄρ' οἴεσθε, ὅτε τοὺς τυράννους έξέβαλλε, (τοὺς Θετταλούς) προσδοκᾶν κ. τ. λ.; for how unwillingly do you think the Olynthian's used to hear it, if any one said anything against Philip in those times when he was ceding Anthemus to them, &c.? Do you think they were expecting to suffer such things? Do you think that the Thessalians, when he was expelling the despots, were expecting, &c. ? Dem. Phil. II, p. 70, 25 to p. 71, 12. (The direct discourse here was πῶς ἤκουον, εἰ . . . λέγοι; and προσεδόκων;) Καὶ γὰρ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων ἡμῶν λέγοντας ἀκούω τούτω τῷ ἔθει χρησθαι, I hear that they used to follow this custom. DEM. Ol. III. 34, 17. Τὰ μὲν πρὸ Ελληνος οὐδὲ είναι ἡ ἐπίκλησις αὕτη (sc. Sorei), in the times before Hellen this name does not appear to have even existed. THUC. I, 3. Again, in the same sentence of Thucydides, παρέχεσθαι, to have furnished. Μετά ταῦτα ἔφη σφάς μέν δειπνείν, τὸν δὲ Σωκράτη οὐκ εἰσιέναι τὸν οὖν Αγάθωνα πολλάκις κελεύειν μεταπέμψασθαι τὸν Σωκράτη, ε δε οὐκ εαν. Ριατ. Symp. 175 C. (He said, έδειπνουμεν, ό δε Σ. οὐκ εἰσήει ὁ οὖν 'A. ἐκέλευεν ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ εἴων.) Συντυχεῖν γὰρ (ἔφη) Ατρεστίδα παρὰ Φιλίππου πορευομένω, καὶ μετ αὐτοῦ γύναια καὶ παιδάρια βαδίζειν, for he said that he had met (Aor.) Atrestidas coming from Philip, and that there were walking with him, &c. DEM. F. L. 439, 3. Tour's έγω φημι δείν έμε μη λαθείν, I say that this ought not to have escaped my notice. DEM. Cor. 291, 27. (The direct discourse here vas voûr εδει έμε μη λαθείν. § 49, 2, N. 3.)

For the Imperfect Participle, see § 16, 2.

REMARK 1. This use of the Present of the Infinitive as an Imperfect cannot be too carefully distinguished from its ordinary use after past tenses, where we translate it by the Imperfect, as in ελεγε τὸ στράτευμα μάχεσθαι, he said that the army was fighting. But here μάχεσθαι refers to time present, relatively to έλεγε; whereas, if it had been used as an Imperfect, it would have referred to time past relatively to έλεγε, as in έλεγε τὸ στράτευμα τῆ προτεραία μάχεσθαι, he said that the army had been fighting on the day before. In the former case the direct discourse was μάχεται, in the latter it was ἐμάχετο. Such an *Imperfect* Infinitive differs from the Aorist in the same construction only by expressing a continued or repeated action (as in the Indicative): it gives, in fact, the only means of representing in the Infinitive what is usually expressed by λέγει ὅτι έποίει, he says that he was doing, differing from λέγει ὅτι ἐποίησεν, he says that he did. (For the rare use of the Present Optative to represent the Imperfect in the same way, see § 70, 2, N. 1, (b).) It must be observed, that this construction is never used unless the context makes it certain that the Infinitive represents an Imperfect and not a Present, so that no ambiguity can arise. See the examples.

REMARK 2. This important distinction between the ordinary Present Infinitive referring to the past (when it takes its time from a past tense on which it depends), and the same tense used as an Imperfect and referring to the past by its own signification, seems to be overlooked by those who would call the former also a case of Imperfect Infinitive. But in the former case έφη τοῦτο ποιείν is translated he said that he was doing this merely to suit the English idiom, whereas the Greeks used the Present because the time was to be present (relatively to $\tilde{\epsilon}\phi\eta$), the direct discourse being τοῦτο ποιῶ: in the other case, however, ἔφη τοῦτο ποιείν τῆ προτεραία, he said that he had been doing this the day before, the Greeks used ποιείν as a regular Imperfect (relatively to έφη), the direct discourse being τοῦτο ἐποίουν. So in Latin (Cic. Phil. VIII, 10), Q. Scaevolam memoria teneo bello Marsico, cum esset summa senectute, quotidie facere omnibus conveniendi potestatem sui. (Cic. de Off. I, 30), Q. Maximum accepimus facile celare, tace e, dissimulare, insidiari, praeripere hostium consilia.

The frequency of such constructions and their principle have been often overlooked, from the fact that they occur only when the

context prevents all possible ambiguity.

16. 1. The Present Participle regularly refers to a continued or repeated action, which is contemporary with that of the leading verb. E. g.

Τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν νομίζοντες κ. τ. λ., they do this because they think, &c. 'Εποίουν νομίζοντες, they were doing it in the thought, &c. 'Εποίησαν νομίζοντες, they did it lecause they thought, &c. Ποίη-

σουσιν νομίζοντες, they will do it in the thought, &n. Ταῦτ' ἐπράχθη Κόνωνος στρατηγοῦντος, these things were done when Conon was general. Isoo. Evag. p. 200 C. § 56. (Στρατηγοῦντος is present relatively to ἐπράχθη.) Καὶ τοιαῦτα πράττων τί ἐποίει; and in doing such things what was he doing? Dem. Phil. III, 114, 20.

Note. When the Present Participle is used like an ordinary Adjective or Substantive (as in § 108), it occasionally refers to time absolutely present, even when the leading verb is not present. This must always be denoted by an adverb like $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$, or by something else in the context. E. g.

Τὴν νῦν Βοιωτίαν καλ ου μένην ὅκησαν, they settled in the country now called Boeotia. ΤΗυς. Ι, 12. Ὁ τοίνυν Φίλιπτος ἐξ ἀρχῆς, οὔπω Διοπείθους στρατηγοῦντος, οὐδὲ τῶν ὅντων ἐν Χερρονήσω νῦν ἀπεσταλμένων, Σέρρειον καὶ Δορίσκον ἐλάμβανε, Philip then in the beginning, when Diopeithes was not yet general, and when the soldiers who ARE NOW in the Chersonese had not yet been sent out, seized upon Serrium and Doriscus. Dem. Phil. III, 114, 15. (Here στρατηγοῦντος is present to the time of ἐλάμβανε, while ὅντων is present to the time of speaking.)

2. The Present Participle is also used as an Imperfect, like the Present Infinitive. With the Participle this use is not confined (as it is with the Infinitive) to indirect discourse. E. g.

Οἱ συμπρεσβεύοντες καὶ παρόντες καταμαρτυρήσουσιν, those who were his colleagues on the embassy and who were present will testify. Dem. F. L. 381, 5. (Here the embassy is referred to as a well-known event in the past.) Φαίνεται γὰρ ἡ νῦν Ἑλλὰς καλουμένη οἱ πάλαι βεβαίως οἰκουμένη, ἀλλὰ μεταναστάσεις τε οὖσαι τὰ πρότερα, καὶ ῥάδίως ἔκαστοι τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἀπολείποντες, ὶ. e. the following things are evident, Ἑλλὰς οὐ πάλαι βεβαίως ἀκεῖτο, ἀλλὰ μεταναστάσεις ἤσαν, καὶ ἔκαστοι τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἀπέλειπον. ΤΗυς. Ι, 2. Οἶδα τὸν Σωκράτην δεικνύντα τοῖς ξυνοῦσιν ἐαυτὸν καλὸν κάγαθὸν ὅντα. Οἶδα δὲ κάκείνω σωφρονοῦντε, ἔστε Σωκράτει συνήστην. ΧΕΝ. Μem. Ι, 2, 18. (The direct discourse here was ἐδείκνυ and ἐσωφρονείτην.)

The principles stated in § 15, 3, with Remarks (cf. § 73, 1) in regard to the Present Infinitive used as an Imperfect apply equally to the Participle.

REMARK. The rules for the time of the Infinitive and Participle given in this chapter do not include the Infinitive and Participle with a. For these see Chapter III. § 41.

PERFECT AND PLUPERFECT.

A. In the Indicative.

§ 17. 1. The Perfect represents an action as already finished at the present time; as γέγραφα, I have written

(that is, my writing is now finished).

2. The Pluperfect represents an action as already finished at some specified past time; as ἐγεγράφειν, I had written (that is, my writing was finished at some specified past time).

Note 1. The consideration that the Perfect, although it implies the performance of the action in past time, yet states only that it stands completed at the present time, will explain why the Perfect is classed with the Present and Future among the primary tenses, that is, the tenses of present or future time.

Note 2. The Perfect Indicative and the Pluperfect may be expressed by the Perfect Participle with the Present or Imperfect of simi. Here, however, each part of the compound generally retains its own signification, so that this form expresses more fully the continuance of the result of the action down to the present time (in the case of the Perfect), and down to the past time referred to (in the case of the Pluperfect). E.g.

Πεποιηκώς ἐστιν (or ἢν), he is (or was) in the condition of having done,—he has done (or had done). Ἐμοῦ οἱ νόμοι οἱ μόνον ἀπεγνωκότες είσι μή άδικείν, άλλα και κεκελευκότες ταύτην την δίκης λαμβάνειν, it is the laws which have not only acquitted me of injustice, but have commanded me to inflict this punishment. Lys. de Morte Erat. p. 95, 4. § 34. Οὐρανὸς γεγονώς ἐστί τε καὶ ἔτ ἔσται, heaven has been formed (and still exists), and will still continue. PLAT. Tim. 31 B.

REMARK. The latter part of Note 2 of course does not apply to cases where the compound form is the only one in use, as in the third person plural of the Perfect and Pluperfect Passive and

Middle of mute and liquid verbs.

On the other hand, the simple form very often implies the continuance of the result of the action down to the present time, or down to a specified past time; but not so distinctly as the compound form, and not necessarily. (See the last two examples.) E. g.

Επιμελώς οι θεοί ων οι ἄνθρωποι δέονται κατεσκευάκασιν, the Gods have carefully provided what men need. XEN. Mem. IV, 3, 3. Των ποιητών τινες ύποθήκας καταλελοίπασιν, some of the poets have left us maxims. Isoc. Nicocl. p. 15 B. § 3. 'Ακήκοα μέν τουνομα, μνημονεύω δ' οῦ, I have heard the name, but I do not remember it. Plat. Theaet. 144 B: "Α σοι τύχη κέχρηκε, ταῦτ' ἀφείλετο, Fortune has taken back what she has lent you. Menand. Frag. Incert. No. 41.

Note 3. The Perfect of many verbs has the signification of a Present, which is usually explained by the peculiar meaning of these verbs. Thus θνήσκειν, to die, τεθνηκέναι, to be dead; καλεῖν, to call, κεκλησθαι, to be called or named; γίγνεσθαι, to become, γεγονέναι, to be; μιμνήσκειν, to remind, μεμνησθαι, to remember; οίδα (novi), I know; &c.

The Pluperfect of such verbs has the signification of the Imperfect; as olda, I know, ήδειν, I knew. (§ 29, N. 5.)

NOTE 4. In Homer and Herodotus the Pluperfect is sometimes

found in nearly the same sense as the Aorist. E. g.

Βεβλήκει γλουτὸν κατὰ δεξιόν. II. V, 66. (Here two Aorists follow, referring to the same time as β εβλήκει.) Ταῦτα ὡς ἐπύθοντο, ὡρμέατο βοηθέεω, when they heard this, they started to carry aid. HDT. IX, 61. "Αλλοι δὲ ἡγεμόνας ἔχοντες ὡρμέατο ἐπὶ τὸ ἰρόν. HDT VIII, 35.

NOTE 5. In epistles, the Perfect and Aorist are sometimes used where we might expect the Present, the writer transferring himself to the time of the reader. E. g.

'Απέσταλκά σοι τόνδε τὸν λόγον, I send you this speech. Isoc. Demon. § 2. Μετ' 'Αρταβάζου, ὅν σοι ἔπεμψα, πράσσε. ΤΗυς. Ι, 129. (Here ον ἔπεμψα refers to the man who was to carry the letter.) So scripsi in Latin.

NOTE 6. The perfect sometimes refers to the future, to denote the certainty or likelihood that an action will immediately take place, in a sense similar to that of the Present (§ 10, N. 7), but with more emphasis, as the change in time is greater. E. g.

"Ωστ' εΐ με τόξων εγκρατής αισθήσεται, ὅλωλα, Ι shall perish at once. Soph. Phil. 75. Κάν τοῦτο νικῶμεν, πάνθ' ἡμῖν πεποίηται. ΧεΝ. Αn. I, 8, 12. So perii in Latin.

The Pluperfect can express the same certainty or likelihood transferred to the past.

B. Perfect in the Dependent Moods.

§ 18. As the Perfect Indicative represents an act as finished at the *present* time, so the Perfect of any of the dependent moods represents an act as *finished* at the time (present, past, or future) at which the Present of that mood would represent it as *going on*.

1. The Perfect Subjunctive and Optative are very often expressed in the active, and almost always in the passive and middle, by the Perfect Participle with $\hat{\omega}$ and $\epsilon i \eta \nu$; and can always be resolved into these. Their time, therefore, in each case, can be seen by applying the principles stated in §§ 12 and 13 to the $\hat{\omega}$ or $\epsilon i \eta \nu$. Where the Present would denote future time, the Perfect denotes future-perfect time. E. g.

Τὸ χρόνον γεγενησθαι πολύν δέδοικα μή τινα λήθην ὑμῖν πεποιήκη, I fear lest the fact that a long time has passed may (when you come to decide the case) prove to have caused in you some forgetfulness DEM. F. L. 342, 10. (Μὴ ποιῆ would mean lest it may cause, the time being the same as before.) Χρὴ αὐτὰ [ἃ τελευτήσαντα ἐκάτερον περιμένει] ακούσαι, ίνα τελέως έκάτερος αὐτῶν απειλή φη τὰ ὀφειλόμενα, we must hear what awaits each of them after death, that (when we have finished) each may have fully received his deserts. Plat. Rep. X. 614 Α. Τούς μεν ἄλλους, κῶν δεδωκότες ὧσιν εὐθύνας, τὴν ἀειλογίαν όρῶ προτεινομένους, I see that other men, even if they have already given their accounts, -i. e. even if they are (in the state of) persons who have given their accounts, — always offer a perpetual reckoning. DEM. F. L. 341, 14. 'Ανδρείον νε πάνυ νομίζομεν, δε αν πεπλήγη πατέρα. we always consider one who has bealen his father very manly. ARIST. Av. 1350. Νόμον θήσειν μηδενί των Έλληνων ύμας βοηθείν ος αν μή πρότερος βεβοηθηκώς υμίν ή, i. e. to assist no one who shall not previously have assisted you. DEM. F. L. 345, 28. (Os aν μη πρότερος Bonθη would mean who shall not previously assist you. The Aorist βοηθήση would differ very little from the Perfect. See § 20, N. 2.)

"Εδεισαν μή λύσσα ήμιν έμπεπτώκοι, they feared lest madness might prove to have fallen upon us. XEN. An. V, 7, 26. (Μή έμπίπτοι would mean lest it might fall upon us.) Πως οὐκ αν οἰκτρότατα πάντων έγὼ $\pi \in \pi \circ \nu \theta$ ως εἶην, εἶ έμὲ ψηφίσαιντο εἶναι ξένον; how should I not have suffered the most pitiable of all things, if they should vote me to be an alien? DEM. Eubul. 1312, 17. (This could have been expressed, with a very slight difference in meaning, πῶς οὐ πεπονθώς έσομαι, Fut. Perf., έαν ψηφίσωνται; how shall I not have suffered, &c.) Εὶ ὁτιοῦν πεπονθώς εκάτερος ἡμῶν εἴη, οὐ καὶ ἀμφότεροι ἃν τοῦτο πεπόνθοιμεν; if each of us should have suffered anything whatsoever, would not both of us have suffered it? ΡΊΑΤ. Hipp. M. 301 A. Οὐκ αν δια τοῦτό γ' εἶεν οὐκ εὐθὺς δεδωκότες, this, at least, cannot be the reason why they did not pay it at once; i. e. they would not (on inquiry) prove to have not paid it on this account. Dem. Onet. I, 867, 1. So Soph. Oed. T. 840. Ελεγε ὅσα ἀγαθὰ Κῦρος Πέρσας πεποιήκοι, he told how many services Cyrus had done the Persians. HDT. HI. 75. (Πεποιήκοι here represents πεποίηκε of the direct discourse.) Οὖτοι ἔλεγον ὡς πεντακόσιοι αὐτοῖς εἴησαν έκ του Πειραιώς δεδεκασμένοι. Lys. in Philocr. p. 182, § 12. (Here the direct discourse was πεντακόσιοί είσιν δεδεκασμένοι.)

NOTE. The Perfect Subjunctive in protasis (§ 50, 1) corresponds exactly to the Latin Future Perfect Indicative; but the Greek seldom uses this cumbrous Perfect, preferring the less precise Aorist (§ 20, N. 2). The Perfect Optative, in both protasis and apodosis, corresponds to the Latin Perfect Subjunctive, but is seldom used.

The Perfect Optative can seldom be accurately expressed in English. For when we use the English forms would have suffered and should have suffered to translate the Perfect Optative, these are merely vaguer expressions for will and shall have suffered. (See the examples above.) I should have suffered is commonly past in English, being equivalent to επαθον α, but here it is future, and is therefore liable to be misunderstood. There is no more reference to past time, however, in the Perfect Optative with α, than there is in the Future Perfect Indicative in such expressions as μάτην ἐμοὶ κεκλαύσεται, I shall have had my whipping for nothing (referring to one received in his boyhood); Arist. Nub. 1436.

2. The Perfect Imperative may express a command that something just done or about to be done shall be decisive and final. It is thus equivalent to the Perfect Participle with the Imperative of $\epsilon i\mu i$. E. g.

Ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ταύτη εἰρήσθω, let so much have been thus said, i. e let what has been thus said be sufficient. Plat. Crat. 401 D. But ὅμως δὲ εἰρήσθω ὅτι, κ. τ. λ., still let as much as this (which follows) be said (once for all), that, &c. Plat. Rep. X, 607 C. Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων ταῦτά μοι προ εἰρήσθω, let this have been said (once for all) by way of introduction. Isoc. Paneg. p. 43 D. § 14. Ταῦτα πεπαίσθω τε ὑμῖν, καὶ ἴσως ἰκανῶς ἔχει, let this be the end of the play, &c. Plat. Euthyd. 278 D. Τετάχθω ἡμῖν κατὰ δημοκρατίαν ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνήρ, let such a man remain where we have placed him, &c. Plat. Rep. VIII, 561 E. ἀπειργάσθω δὴ ἡμῖν αῦτη ἡ πολιτεία, let now this be a sufficient description of this form of government. Id. 553 A. Μέχρι τοῦδε ὡρίσθω ὑμῶν ἡ βραδυτής, at this point let the limit of your sluggishness be fixed. Thuc. I, 71.

This use seems to be confined to the third person singular of the passive and middle. The third person plural in the same sense could be expressed by the Perfect Participle with the Imperative of είμί, as in Plat. Rep. VI, 502 A: οὖτοι τοίνυν τοῦτο πεπεισμένοι ἔστων, grant then that these have been persuaded of this.

NOTE 1. On this principle the Perfect Imperative is used in mathematical language, to imply that something is to be considered as proved or assumed once for all, or that lines drawn or points fixed are to remain as data for a following demonstration. E. g.

E $l\lambda \dot{\eta} \dot{\phi} \theta \omega$ ἐπὶ τῆς AB τυχὸν σημείον τὸ Δ, καὶ ἀφηρήσθω ἀπὸ τῆς AΓ τῆ AΔ ἴση ἡ AE, let any point Δ be (assumed as) taken in the line AB, and AE equal to AΔ as cut off from AΓ EUCL. I, Pr. 9.

NOTE 2. The Perfect Imperative of the second person is rare; when it is used, it seems to be a little more emphatic than the Present or Aorist. E. g.

'Hè σὺ τόνδε δέδεξο. II. V, 228. Mỳ πεφόβησθε. Thuc. VI, 17. Μόνον σὺ ἡμῦν πιστὰ θεῶν πεποίησο καὶ δεξιὰν δός, only make us (immediately and once for all) solemn pledges and give the right hand. Xen. Cyr. IV, 2, 7. Πέπαυσο, stop l not another word! Dem. Timoc. 721, 6.

Note 3. In verbs whose Perfect has the force of a Present (§ 17, N. 3) the Perfect Imperative is the ordinary form, as μέμνησο, κεκλήσθω, ἐστάτω, τεθνάτω, ἴστω. The Perfect Imperative active seems to have been used only in such verbs. Occasionally we find the periphrastic form with the Participle and εἰμί, as ἔστω ξυμβεβηκυΐα. Plat. Leg. V, 736 B.

3. (a.) The Perfect Infinitive in indirect discourse represents a Perfect Indicative of the direct discourse, and therefore denotes an action which is *finished* at the time of the leading verb. E. g.

Φησὶ τοῦτο πεπραχέναι, he says that he has done this; ἔφη τοῦτο πεπραχέναι, he said that he had done this; φήσει τοῦτο πεπραχέναι, he will say that he has done this (the direct discourse in each case being πέπραχα). Έφη χρήμαθ ἐαυτῷ τοὺς Θηβαίους ἐπικεκηρυχέναι, he said that the Thebans had offered a reward for his seizure. Dem. F. L. 347, 26. In ARIST. Nub. 1277, προσκεκλησυβαίν μοι δοκεῖς (according to Mss. Rav. & Ven.), you seem to me to be sure to be summoned to court (to be as good as already summoned), the Infinitive represents a Perfect Indicative referring to the future (§ 17, N. 6). So κεκωλῦσθαι ἐδόκει. Thuc. II, 8.

- (b.) In other constructions the Perfect Infinitive represents an act as *finished* at the time at which the Present in the same construction would represent it as going on (§ 15, 1). E. g.
- Où β ou λ e \hat{v} e σ θ aι $\hat{\epsilon}$ τι $\mathring{\omega}$ ρα, ἀλλὰ β e β ou λ e \hat{v} σ θ aι της γὰρ $\hat{\epsilon}$ πιούσης νυκτὸς πάντα ταῦτα δ e $\hat{\epsilon}$ ι πεπρ $\hat{\alpha}$ χ θ aι, it is no longer time to be deliberating, but (it is time) to have finished deliberating; for all this must be done (and finished) within the coming night. Plat. Crit. 46 A. Kal μὴν περὶ $\mathring{\omega}$ ν γε προσετάξατε προσήκει δ ι $\mathring{\omega}$ κηκ έναι, and it is his duty to have attended (during his absence) to the business about which you gave him instructions. Dem. F. L. 342, 28. (This refers to an ambassador presenting his accounts on his return.) Ευνετύγχανε πολλαχοῦ δ ιὰ τὴν στενοχωρίαν τὰ μὲν $\tilde{\alpha}$ λλοις $\hat{\epsilon}$ μ β ε β ληκέναι τὰ δ ' αὐτοὺς $\hat{\epsilon}$ μ β ε β λη σ θαι, δ ύο τε περὶ μίαν . . $\hat{\epsilon}$ υνηρτ $\hat{\eta}$ σθαι, it often befell them to have made an attack on one side and (at the same time) to have been attacked themselves on the

other, &c. Thuc. VII, 70. 'Ανάγκη γὰρ τὰ μέν μέγιστ' αὐτῶν ἤδη κατακεχρησθαι μικρά δέ τινα παραλελειφθαι, for it must be that the most important subjects have been used up, and that only unimportant ones have been left. Isoc. Pan. p. 55 D. § 74. Οὐκ ήθελου έμβαίνειν διὰ τὸ καταπεπληχθαι τη ήσση, they were unwilling to embark on account of having been terrified by the defeat. Thuc. VII, 72. Τὸ γὰρ πολλὰ ἀπολωλεκέναι κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τῆς ἡμετέρας άμελείας αν τις θείη δικαίως, τὸ δὲ μήτε πάλαι τοῦτο πεπονθέναι πεφηνέναι τέ τινα ήμιν συμμαχίαν τούτων αντίρροπον, της παρ εκείνων εύνοίας εὐεργέτημ' αν έγωγε θείην, for our having lost many things during the war any one might justly charge upon our neglect; but our never having suffered this before and the fact that an alliance has now appeared to us to make up for these losses I should consider a benefaction, &c. Dem. Ol. I, 12, 3. (Compare γεγενησθαι in the first example under § 18, 1.) "Εφθασαν παροικοδομήσαντες, ώστε μηκέτι μήτε αὐτοὶ κωλύεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ἐκείνους τε καὶ παντάπασιν ἀπεστερηκέναι σφας ἀποτειχίσαι, i. e. they carried their own wall beyond that of the Athenians, so as no longer to be themselves interfered with by them, and so as to have effectually prevented them, &c. Thuc. VII, 6. Ἐπεμελήθη καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, ώστε τῶν παρόντων τοις ανθρώποις αγαθών μηδέν μέν άνευ της πόλεως είναι, τα δέ πλείστα διὰ ταύτην γεγενησθαι. Isoc. Pan. p. 48 B. § 38. Τοιαῦτα καὶ τοσαῦτα κατεσκεύασαν ἡμῖν, ἄστε μηδενὶ τῶν ἐπτιγιγνομένων ὑπερβολὴν λ ελεῖφθαι, they made such and so great acquisitions as to have no possibility of surpassing them left to any one who should come after them. DEM. Ol. III, 35, 18. Δίδομεν αὐτοῖς προῖκα συγκεκό φθαι, we allow them to have cut us up for nothing (i. e. we make no account of their having done so). ARIST. Nub. 1426.

Note. The Perfect Infinitive is sometimes used like the Perfect Imperative (§ 18, 2), signifying that the action is to be decisive and permanent, and sometimes it seems to be merely more emphatic than the Present or Aorist Infinitive. E. g.

Εἶπον τὴν θύραν κεκλεῖσθαι, they ordered that the door should be shut and remain so. Xen. Hell. V, 4, 7. Βουλόμενος ἀγῶνι καὶ δικαστηρίφ μοι διωρίσθαι παρ' ὑμίν ὅτι τἀναντία ἐμοὶ καὶ τούτοις πέπρακται, i. e. wishing to have it definitely and once for all settled in your minds. Dem. F. L. 410, 28. Θελούσας πρὸς πύλαις πεπτωκέναι, eager to fall before the gates: Aesch. Sept. 462. "Ηλαυνεν ἐπὶ τοὺς Μένωνος, ιστ' ἐκείνους ἐκπεπλῆχθαι καὶ τρέχειν ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα, he marched against the soldiers of Menon, so that they were (once for all) thoroughly frightened and ran to arms. Xen. An. I, 5, 13. (Here ἐκπεπλῆχθαι is merely more emphatic than the Present would have been.)

REMARK. The Perfect Infinitive belongs also to the Pluperfect, and is occasionally used to represent that tense in indirect discourse. This occurs chiefly (perhaps only) when the Infinitive is modified by an See the first example under § 41, 2.

4. The Perfect Participle in all its uses refers to an

action as already finished at the time of the leading verb. E. g.

Έπαινοῦσι τοὺς εἰρηκότας, they praise those who have spoken.
Έπήνεσαν τοὺς εἰρηκότας, they praised those who had spoken.
Έπαινέσουσι τοὺς εἰρηκότας, they will praise those who have (then) spoken.
Έπέδειξα οὐδὲν ἀληθὲς ἀπηγγελκότα (Αἰσχίνην), I showed that Aeschines had announced nothing that was true (i. e. I showed, οὐδὲν ἀληθὲς ἀπήγγελκεν). $D_{\rm EM}$. F. L. 396, 30.

AORIST.

A. In the Indicative.

§ 19. The Aorist Indicative expresses the simple momentary occurrence of an action in past time; as ἔγραψα, I wrote.

This fundamental idea of simple occurrence remains the essential characteristic of the Aorist through all the dependent moods, however indefinite they may be in regard to time.

Note 1. The Aorist of verbs which denote a state or condition generally expresses the entrance into that state or condition. E. g.

Βασιλεύω, I am king, ἐβασίλευσα, I became king; ἄρχω, I hold office, ἢρξα, I obtained office; πλουτῶ, ἐπλούτησα, I became rich. Τỹ ἀληθεία συνώκει καὶ οὐδέπω ἀπολέλοιπεν ἀλλὰ παρὰ ζῶντος Τιμοκράτους ἐκείνω συνώκη σε, she was his wife in good faith, and has not even yet been divorced; but she went to live with him, &c. Dem. Onet. I, 873, 8.

Note 2. The Aorist differs from the Imperfect by denoting the momentary occurrence of an action or state, while the Imperfect denotes a continuance or repetition of the same action or state. This is especially obvious in the verbs mentioned in Note 1, as ἐβασιλευον, ἦρχον, ἐπλούτουν, I was king, held office, was rich. (See especially the last example under N. 1.) The Aorist is therefore the tense most common in narration, the Imperfect in description. The Aorist may sometimes refer to a series of repetitions; but it refers to them collectively, as a single whole, while the Imperfect refers to them separately, as individuals. So the Aorist may even refer to a continued action, if (as a whole) it is viewed as a single event in past time. E. g.

Έγω δὲ ἦλθον, εἶδον, ἐνίκησα, Ι came, Ι saw, Ι conquered (Veni, vidi, vici) ΑΡΡ. Bell. Civ. II, 91. So ἐβασίλευσε δέκα ξη may be used to mean he had a reign of ten years (which is now viewed as a single past event); whereas ἐβασίλευε δέκα ἔτη would mean he continued to reign ten years.

Note 3. The distinction between the Imperfect and Aorist was sometimes neglected, especially by the older writers. See § 11, Note 5.

Note 4. (a.) The Aorist is sometimes found where we should expect the Perfect or the Pluperfect; the action being simply referred to the past, without the more exact specification afforded by the Perfect and Pluperfect. E. g.

Τῶν οἰκετῶν οὐδένα κατέλιπεν, ἀλλ' ἄπαντα πέπρακεν. ΑΕ-ΒCHIN. Timarch. § 99. Ἐτράποντο ἐς τὸν Πάνορμον, ὅθενπερ ἀνηγάγοντο, they turned towards Panormus, whence they had set sail. THUC. II, 92. Κῦρον δὲ μεταπέμπεται ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἡς αὐτὸν Ψατράπην ἐποίησεν, of which he had once made him satrap. ΧΕΝ. An. I, 1, 2.

(b.) Especially the Aorist is generally used, even where we should expect the Pluperfect, after particles of time like ἐπεί, ἐπειδή, ὡς (when), ὅτε, ἔως, πρίν, &c. Ε. g.

'Επειδή ἐτελεύτη σε Δαρεῖος καὶ κατέστη 'Αρταξέρξης, after Darius tad died and Artaxerxes had become established. Xen. An. I, 1, 3. Οὐ πρόσθεν ἐξενεγκεῖν ἐτόλμησαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς πόλεμον, πρὶν τοὺς ετρατηγοὺς ἡμᾶν συνέλα βον, before they had seized our generals. Xen. An. II, 2, 29. Οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ λιμένος πολυβενθέος ἐντὸς ἴκοντο, when they had entered. II. I, 432. So in Latin, postquam venit, after be had come.

NOTE 5. The Aorist is sometimes used in colloquial language by the poets (especially the dramatists), when a momentary action, which is just taking place, is to be expressed as if it had already happened. E. g.

Έπήνεσ' ἔργον καὶ πρόνοιαν ἡν ἔθου, I must approve your act, &c. Soph. Aj. 536. "Ησθην ἀπειλαῖς, ἐγέλασα ψολοκομπίαις, I am amused by your threats, I cannot help laughing, &c. Arist. Eq. 696.

NOTE 6. The Aorist sometimes refers vividly to the future, like the Present or Perfect (§ 10, N. 7; § 17, N. 6); as ἀπωλόμην εἶ με λείψεις, I perish if you leave me, Eur. Alc. 386.

So in questions with τί οὐ expressing surprise that something is not already done, and implying an exhortation to do it; as τί οὖν οὐ διηγήσω; why then do you not tell us the story? Plat. Prot. 310 A. See also τί οὖν οὐκ ἐκαλέσαμεν; Prot. 317 D.

B. Aorist in the Dependent Moods.

REMARK. The Aorist of the dependent moods differs from the Present as is explained in the Remark before § 12. § 20. The Aorist Subjunctive denotes a single or momentary action, the time of which is determined by the rules that apply to the time of the Present Subjunctive, § 12:—

That is, in clauses denoting a purpose or object, after va, $\mu \acute{\eta}$, &c., it refers to time future relatively to the leading verb; in conditional sentences (including conditional relative and temporal sentences),—in ordinary protasis (§ 50, 1), the Subjunctive refers to the future; in general suppositions after verbs of present time (§ 51), it refers to indefinite time represented as present. In independent sentences it refers to the future. E. g.

Δέδοικα μὴ ἐπιλαθώ μεθα τῆς οἴκαδε ὁδοῦ, I fear lest we may forget the road home. Xen. An. III, 2, 25. Διανοεῖται τὴν γέφυραν λῦσαι, ὡς μὴ διαβῆτε ἀλλ' ἀποληφθῆτε, he intends to destroy the bridge, that you may not pass over but be caught. Id. II, 4, 17. *Ην τὴν εἰρήπνα τοιησώμεθα, μετὰ πολλῆς ἀσφαλείας τὴν πόλιν οἰκήσομεν, if we shall make the peace, &c. Isoc. Pac. p. 163 A. § 20. 'Ως ἀν εἴπω πειθώμεθα, let us obey as I shall direct. II. IX, 704. *Ην ἐγγὺς ἔλθη θάνατος, οὐδεὶς βούλεται θνήσκειν, if death comes near (the moment that death comes near), no one wants to die. Eur. Alc. 671. *Ον μὲν ἄν ἴδη ἀγνῶτα (sc. ὁ κύων), χαλεπαίνει· ὁν δ' ἀν γνώριμον (sc. ἴδη), ἀσπάζεται, i. e. whomsoever the dog sees (at any time). Plat. Rep. II, 376 A. 'Αναλογισώμεθα τὰ ὁμολογημένα ἡμῖν, let us enumerate the points which have been conceded by us. Plat. Prot. 332 D. Μηδὲν φοβηθῆς, fear not (in this case). (But μηδὲν φοβοῦ, be not timid.) Τί ποιήσω; what shall I do (in a single case)? (But τί ποιῶς what shall I do (generally)?) Οὐ μὴ τοῦτο εἴπης, you will not say this. Οὐ μὴ γένηται, it will not happen. So in the Homeric οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι, nor shall I ever see.

See other examples under the rules in Chapter IV.

Note 1. When the Aorist Subjunctive depends on ἐπευδάν (ἐπάν, ἐπήν), after that, it is referred by the meaning of the particle to a moment of time that precedes the action of the leading verb, so that ἐπειδάν τοῦτο ἴδω, ἐλεύσομαι means after I shall have seen this, I will come; and ἐπειδάν τοῦτο ἴδω, ἀπέρχομαι, after I have seen this, I (always) depart. In such cases it is to be translated by our Future Perfect, when the leading verb is future; and by our Perfect, when the leading verb denotes a general truth and is translated by the Present. As the Subjunctive in this construction can never depend

upon a verb expressing simply present time, it is obvious that it can never refer to time absolutely past: we use the Perfect Indicative in translating such Aorists after verbs expressing general truths, merely because we use the Present in translating the leading verb, although that is properly not merely present, but general in its time.

In like manner, after ἔως, πρίν, and other particles signifying until, before that, and even after the relative pronoun or ἐάν, the Aorist Subjunctive may be translated by our Future Perfect or Perfect, when the context shows that it refers to a moment of time preceding that of the leading verb. E. g.

Χρη δε, όταν μεν τιθη σθε τούς νόμους, όποιοί τινές είσιν σκοπείν. έπειδαν δε θησθε, φυλάττειν και χρησθαι, while you are enacting laws, you must look to see of what kind they are; but after you have enacted them, you must guard and use them. DEM. Mid. 525, 11. (Here the Present $\tau \iota \theta \hat{n} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ after $\delta \tau a \nu$, while, refers to an action continuing through the time of the leading verb; but $\theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ after έπειδάν, after that, refers to time past relatively to the leading verb.) Ταῦτα, ἐπειδὰν περὶ τοῦ γένους εἶπω, τότε, ὰν βούλησθε ἀκούειν, ἐρῶ, when I shall have spoken about my birth, then, if you desire to hear, I will speak of these things. DEM. Eubul. 1303, 25. (Here the Aorist είπω, though absolutely future, denotes time past with reference to έρω) Ἐπειδὰν διαπράξωμαι ἃ δέομαι, ήξω, when I shall have accomplished what I desire, I will come. XEN. An. II, 3, 29. Έπειδαν δε κρύψωσι γη, ανηρ ήρημένος ύπο της πόλεως λέγει έπ' αὐτοῖς ἔπαινον τὸν πρέποντα, when they have covered them with earth, &c. ΤΗυς. Π, 34. "Εως ἃν σώζηται τὸ σκάφος, τότε χρὴ προθύμους είναι ἐπειδαν δὲ ἡ θάλαττα ὑπέρσχη, μάταιος ἡ σπουδή, as long as it remains in safety (Present); — but the moment that the sea has overwhelmed it (Aorist). Dem. Phil. III, 128, 22. "Ews αν εκμάθης, έχ' ἐλπίδα, until you have learnt fully, have hope. Soph. O. T. 834. Mia δέ κλίνη κενή φέρεται των άφανων, οι αν μή ευρεθωσιν ές avaiρεσιν, and one bier is always carried empty, in honor of the missing, whose bodies have not been found. Thuc. II, 34. Τίς διανοείται, ά αν άλλοι τη άρετη καταπράξωσι, τούτων Ισομοιρείν; who ever thinks of having an equal share in those things which others by their valor have acquired? ΧΕΝ. Суг. Η, 3, 5. Πάνθ' το αν έκ πολέμου γιγνομένης εἰρήνης προεθή, ταῦτα τοῖς ἀμελήσασιν ἀπόλλυται, all things which are (or have been) abandoned when peace is made are always lost to those who abandoned them. Dem. F. L. 388, 9. *Hv & άρα καί του πείρα σφαλώσιν, αντελπίσαντες άλλα έπλήρωσαν την χρείαν, if they have been disappointed in anything, they always supply the deficiency, &c. Thuc. I, 70. (See § 30, 1.) Οὐχὶ παύσομαι, πρίν αν σε των σων κύσιον στήσω τέκνων, I will not cease before I have (shall have) made in master of your children. SOPH. O. C.

1040. Μη στέναζε πριν μάθης, do not groan until you have heard. SOPH. Phil. 917.

NOTE 2. The use of the Aorist Subjunctive mentioned in Note 1 sometimes seems to approach very near to that of the Perfect Subjunctive (§ 18, 1); and we often translate both by the same tense in English. But with the Perfect, the idea of an action completed at the time referred to is expressed by the tense of the verb, without aid from any particle or from the context; with the Aorist, the idea of relative past time can come only from the particle or the context. (See § 18, 1, Note.) E. g.

*Ον μεν αν ίδη αγνώτα (δ κύων), χαλεπαίνει · ον δ' αν γνώριμον (ἴδη), ἀσπάζεται, κᾶν μηδεν πώποτε ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὸν πεπόνθη, whomsoever he sees whom he knows, he fawns upon, even if he has hitherto received no kindness from him. PLAT. Rep. II, 376 A. Compare this with έὰν ἀγαθόν τι πάθη ὑπό τινος, ἀσπάζεται, if he ever happens to receive any kindness from any one, he always fawns upon him; and επειδάν άγαθόν τι πάθη, ασπάζεται, after he has received any kindness, he always fawns upon him. See examples under § 18, 1.

§ 21. 1. The Aorist Optative, when it is not in indirect discourse, denotes a single or momentary action. the time of which is determined by the rules that apply to the time of the Present Optative, § 13, 1: -

That is, in clauses denoting a purpose or object, after $\tilde{l}\nu\alpha$, $\delta\pi\omega$ s, $\mu\dot{\eta}$, &c., it refers to time future relatively to the leading verb; in conditional sentences (including conditional relative and temporal sentences), -- in ordinary protasis (§ 50, 2), the Optative refers to the future (only more vaguely than the Subjunctive); in general suppositions after verbs of past time (§ 51), it refers to indefinite past time. In independent sentences it refers to the future. E. g.

Φίλιππος εν φόβο ήν μη εκφύγοι τὰ πράγματα αὐτόν, Philip was in fear lest the control of affairs might escape him. DEM. Cor. 236, 19. El ελθοι, πάντ' αν ιδοι, if he should go, he would see all. El ελθοι, πώνθ' εώρα, if ever (whenever) he went, he (always) saw all. Οὐδ' εὶ πάντες ἔλθοιεν Πέρσαι, πλήθει γε οὐχ ὑπερβαλοίμεθ' αν τοὺς πολεμίους, not even if all the Persians should come, should we surpass the enemy in numbers. XEN. Cyr. II, 1, 8. "Ότε έξω τοῦ δεινοῦ γένοιντο, καὶ έξείη πρὸς ἄλλους ἄρχοντας ἀπιέναι, πολλοὶ αὐτὸν ἀπέλειπον, but when they were come out of danger and it was in their power (Present) to go to other commanders, (in all such cases) many left him. XEN. An. II, 6, 12. "Ανευ γάρ άρχύντων οὐδέν αν ούτε καλό»

οὖτε ἀγαθὸν γενοιτο, nothing could be done, &c. Xen. An. III, 1 38. Οὐκ οἶδα ὅ τι ἄν τις χρήσαιτο αὐτοῖς, I do not know what use any one could make of them. Xen. An. III, 1, 40. Εἴθε σὺ τοιοῦτος ὧν φίλος ἡμῖν γένοιο, may you become a friend to us. Xen. Hell. IV, 1, 38. Μὴ γένοιτο, may it not happen.

See other examples under the rules in Chapter IV.

Note. When the Aorist Optative depends upon $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \hat{\eta}$ or $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i$, after that, it is referred by the meaning of the particle to a moment of time preceding that of the leading verb, like the Aorist Subjunctive in § 20, N. 1, so that $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \hat{\eta}$ idoι, $\epsilon \pi \hat{\eta} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma$ means after he had seen, he (always) went away. This gives the Aorist in translation the force of a Pluperfect. So after $\epsilon \omega s$, until, and in the other cases mentioned in § 20, N. 1. E. g.

Οὖς μὲν ἴδοι εὐτάκτως ἴοντας, τίνες τε εἶεν ἠρώτα, καὶ ἐπεὶ πύθοιτο, ἐπήνει, he asked any whom he saw marching in good order, who they were; and after he had ascertained, he praised them. XEN. Cyr. V, 3, 55. Περιεμένομεν ἐκάστοτε ἔως ἀνοιχθείη τὸ δεσμωτήριον ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνοιχθείη, εἰσήειμεν παρὰ τὸν Σωκράτη, we waited each morning until the prison was opened (or had been opened); and after it was opened, we went in to Socrates. Plat. Phaed. 59 D. Οὐδαμόθεν ἀφίεσαν, πρὶν παραθεῖεν αὐτοῖς ἄριστον, before they had placed breakfast before them. XEN. An. IV, 5, 30.

- 2. From the general rule for indirect discourse (§ 69, 1) we derive the following special rules:—
- (a.) First, if the Aorist Optative in indirect discourse represents an Aorist Indicative of the direct discourse, it denotes a momentary or single action which is past with reference to the leading verb. E. g.

"Ελεξαν ὅτι πέμψειε σφᾶς ὁ βασιλεύς, they said that the king had sent them (i. e. they said ἔπεμψεν ἡμᾶς ὁ βασιλεύς). ΧΕΝ. Суг. Π, 4, 7. Τότε ἐγνώσθη ὅτι οἱ βάρβαροι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὑποπέμψαιεν, then it became known that the barbarians had sent the man. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Π, 4, 22. Ἐτόλμα λέγειν ὡς πολλὰ τῶν ἐμῶν λάβοιεν, he dared to say that they had taken much of my property. DΕΜ. Aph. I, 828, 25. Ἡρώτων αὐτὸν εἰ ἀναπλεύσειεν, I asked him whether he had set suil (i. e. I asked him the question, ἀνέπλευσας;). DΕΜ. Polycl. 1223, 21. Ἐπειρώτα τίνα ἄδοι, he asked whom he had seen (i. e. τίνα είδες, whom did you see?). ΗDΤ. I, 31. So I, 116: εἴρετο κόθεν λάβοι.

(b.) But if it represents an Aorist Subjunctive of the direct discourse, it denotes a momentary or single action which is *future* with reference to the leading verb. E. g.

01 Έπιδάμνιοι τὸν θεὸν ἐπήροντο εἶ παραδοῖεν Κορινθίοις τὴν πόλιν, they asked whether they should deliver up their city to the Corinthians (i. e. they asked the question, παραδῶμεν τὴν πόλιν; shall we deliver up our city?). ΤΗ Ι΄ C. I, 25. Ἐσκόπουν ὅπως κάλλιστ ἐνέγκαιμ' αὐτόν, I looked to se: how I could best endure him (i. e. I asked, πῶς ἐνέγκω αὐτόν; how can I endure him?). Ευπ. Ηἰγρ. 393. Διεσιώπησε σκοπῶν ὅ τι ἀποκρίναιτο, he continued silent, thinking what he should answer (i. e. thinking, τί ἀποκρίνωμαι;). ΧΕΝ. Μεμ. IV, 2, 10.

REMARK. Examples of the Aorist Optative representing the Aorist Subjunctive in a dependent luse of the direct discourse, to which the same principles apply, may be found under § 74, 1. The Aorist *Indicative* is, however, generally retained in dependent clauses of indirect quotations: see § 74, 2, with N. 1.

- Note 1. It will be seen by a comparison of the examples under (a) and (b), as in § 13, 2, Note 1, that an ambiguity may sometimes arise from uncertainty whether the Aorist Optative stands for the Aorist Indicative, or for the Aorist Subjunctive in a question of doubt. Thus, ηγνόουν ὅ τι ποιήτο τειαν might mean, they knew not what they had done (the Optative representing τί ἐποιήσσμεν; what did we do?), or they knew not what they should do (the Optative representing τί ποιήσωμεν; what shall we do?). The context must decide in each case; but in most cases the latter construction is intended. (For the manner of avoiding a similar ambiguity, see § 74, 2, N. 1.)
- § 22. The Aorist Imperative refers to a momentary or single action in future time; as εἰπέ μοι, tell me; δότε μοι τοῦτο, give me this.
- § 23. The Aorist Infinitive has two distinct uses, corresponding to the first two uses of the Present Infinitive (§ 15):—
- 1. First, in its ordinary use (either with or without the article), whenever it is not in indirect discourse, it denotes a momentary or single action without regard to time, unless its time is especially defined by the context. E. g.

Πόλεως έστι θάνατος ἀνάστατον γενέσθαι, it is death for a city to be taid waste. Lycurg. in Leocr. p. 155, 35. § 61. Ω σπερ των

ανδρών τοις καλοις κάναθοις αίρετώτερον έστι καλώς άπο θανείν η ζημ αίσχρώς, ούτω καὶ τῶν πόλεων ταις ὑπερεχούσαις λυσιτελείν (ἡγούντο) έξ ανθρώπων αφανισθηναι μαλλον ή δούλαις όφθηναι γενομέναις, as it is preferable for honorable men to dis (Aor.) nobly rather than to continue living (Pres.) in disgrace, so also they thought that it was better (Pres.) for the pre-eminent among states to be (at once) made to disappear from the earth, than to be (once) seen to have fallen int. slavery. Isoc. Paneg. p. 60 C. § 95. Πέμπουσιν ές την Κέρκυραν πρέσβεις, δεόμενοι μη σφας περιοραν Φθειρομένους, άλλα τούς τε Φεύνοντας Ευναλλάξαι σφίσι και τον των βαρβάρων πόλεμον καταλύσαι, asking them not to allow them to be destroyed, but to bring about a reconciliation . . . and to put an end to the war. Thuc. Ι, 24. Τὸ γὰρ γνῶναι ἐπιστήμην που λαβεῖν ἐστιν, to learn is to acquire knowledge. Plat. Theaet. 209 E. Πάντες τὸ καταλιπείν αὐτὰ πάντων μάλιστα φεύγομεν, we all try most of all to avoid leaving them behind. XEN. Mem. II, 2, 3. Οὐ γὰρ τὸ μὴ λαβεῖν τάγαθὰ ούτω γε χαλεπόν ώσπερ το λαβόντα στερηθήναι λυπηρόν. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VII, 5, 82. Τοῦ πιεῖν ἐπιθυμία, the desire of obtaining drink. THUC. VII, 84. Κελεύει αὐτὸν ἐλθεῖν, he commands him to go Έκελευσεν αὐτὸν ελθεῖν, he commanded him to go. Κελεύσει αὐτὸν έλθειν, he will command him to go. Πρός τώ μηδέν έκ της πρεσβείας λαβείν, τους αίχμαλώτους έλύσατο, hesides receiving nothing from the embassy, he ransomed the captives. DEM. F. L. 412, 21. Εἰ πρὸ τοῦ τοὺς Φωκέας ἀπολέσθαι ψηφίσαισθε βοηθεῖν, if before the destruction of the Phocians you should vote to go to their assistance. Dem. Cor. 236, 20. Τὰς αἰτίας προύγραψα, τοῦ μή τινα ζητησαί ποτε έξ ότου τοσούτος πόλεμος κατέστη, that no one may ever ask the reason, why, &c. Thuc. I, 23. Cf. Dem. Cor. 295, 13; Eur. Orest.

REMARK. The Remark which follows § 15, 1 applies also to the Aorist Infinitive.

NOTE 1. For a discussion of the time denoted by the Infinitive when it has the article and also a subject, see Appendix, Π .

Note 2. $X\rho\acute{a}\omega$, $\grave{a}va\iota\rho\acute{e}\omega$, $\theta\epsilon\sigma\pi^i\zeta\omega$, and other verbs signifying to give an oracular response, are sometimes followed by the Aorist (as well as by the Present) Infinitive, which expresses the command, advice, or warning given by the oracle. These verbs here simply take the ordinary construction of verbs of commanding and advising. E. g.

Χρωμένω δὲ τῷ Κύλωνι ἀνεῖλεν ὁ θεός, ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς τῇ μεγίστη ἐορτῷ καταλαβεῖν τὴν ᾿Αθηναίων ἀκρόπολιν, that he should seize. ΤΗυς. Ι, 126. But we find ἀνεῖλεν ἔσεσθαι in ΤΗυς. Ι, 118. Ἐκέχρητο γὰρ τοῖσι Σπαρτιήτησι, ἢ Λακεδαίμονα ἀνάστατον γενέσθαι, ἢ τὸν βασιλέα σφέων ἀπολέσθαι. Η DT. VII, 220. Ἐθέσπισε κομίσαι καὶ εἰσιδεῖν. Ευπ. Iph. Taur. 1014. So Ἔειπε οἰ νούσω ὑπ' ἀργαλέφ φθίσθαι ἢ ὑπὸ Τρώεσσι δαμῆναι, the diviner told him that he must either die by

painful disease at home, or perish at the hands of the Trojans. IL XIII, 667. So after χρησμός, Plat. Rep. III, 415 C.

For the Present see § 15, 1. N. 2.

NOTE 3. The Present of aἴτιός εἰμι, I am the cause, is often used with reference to the past, where logically a past tense should be used; as aἴτιός ἐστι τοὐτφ θανεῖν, he is the cause of his death, instead of aἴτιος ἦν τούτφ θανεῖν, he was the cause of his death. This often gives an ordinary Aorist Infinitive after this form the appearance of a verb of past time, like the Aorist Infinitive in indirect discourse. This will be explained in each case by mentally substituting a past tense for the present. E. g.

A Îτιοι οὖν εἰσι καὶ ὑμῖν πολλῶν ἥδη ψευσθῆναι καὶ δὴ ἀδίκως γέ τινας ἀπολέσθαι, they are the cause why you were deceived and some even perished (i. e. they caused you to be deceived and some even to perish). Lys. de Arist. Bon. 156, 28. § 51. Τεθνᾶσιν οἱ δὲ ζῶντες αἴτιοι θανεῖν. SOPH. Ant. 1173. "Η μοι μητρὶ μὲν θανεῖν μόνη μεταίτιος. SOPH. Trach. 1233.

For the construction of the Infinitive see § 92, 1, Note 2 (end).

2. Secondly, the Aorist Infinitive in indirect discourse is used to represent an Aorist Indicative of the direct discourse, and therefore denotes a momentary or single action, which is *past* relatively to the leading verb. E. g.

Φησὶν τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, he says that he did this (i. e. he says τοῦτο ἐποίησα). Ἔφη τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, he said that he had done this (i. e. he said τοῦτο ἐποίησα). Φήσει τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, he will say that he did this (i. e. he will say τοῦτο ἐποίησα). Ὁ Κῦρος λέγεται γενέσθαι Καμβύσεω, Cyrus is said to have been the son of Cambyses. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 2, 1. Παλαιότατοι λέγονται ἐν μέρει τινὶ τῆς χώρας Κύκλωπες οὶ κῆσαι, they are said to have settled. ΤΗυC. VI, 2. Ἡσαν ΰποπτοι αὐτοῖς μὴ προθύμως σφίσι πέμψαι ἃ ἔπεμψαν, they were suspected of not having sent them with alacrity what they did send. ΤΗυC. VI, 75.

NOTE 1. The principle stated in § 15, 2, N. 1, will decide in doubtful cases whether the Infinitive stands in indirect discourse or in the construction of § 23, 1.

Note 2. Verbs and expressions signifying to hope, to expect, to promise, and the like, after which the Infinitive in indirect discourse would naturally be in the Future (§ 27, N. 3), as representing a Future Indicative of the direct discourse, sometimes take the Aorist (as well as the Present) Infinitive. (See § 15, 2, N. 2.) E. g.

Ἐέλπετο κύδος ἀρέσθαι. he was hoping to obtain glory. II. XII.

407. Πάλιν ἔμολ' ἃ πάρος οὔποτε ἤλπισεν παθεῖν. Εur. Herc. F. 746. Εὶ γὰρ κρατήσειαν τῷ ναυτικῷ, τὸ 'Ρήγιον ἤλπιζον ῥαδίως χειρώσασθαι, they hoped to subdue Rhegium. THUC. IV, 24. Οἰδ' ἄν ἐλπὶς ἦν αὐτὰ βελ ἰω γενέσθαι, there would not be even a hope of their becoming better. Dem. Phil. I, 40, 18. 'Εκ μὲν τοῦ κακῶς πράττειν τὰς πόλεις μεταβολῆς τυχεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον εἰκός ἐστιν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ παντάπασι γενέσθαι ἀνάστατον καὶ τῶν κοινῶν ἐλπίδων στερηθῆναι. Lycurg. in Leocr. p. 155, 30. § 60. (Cf. below, ἐλπὶς ἐκ τοῦ κακῶς πράξαι μεταπεσεῖ.) 'Υποσχόμενος μὴ πρόσθεν παύσασθαι, πρὶν αὐτοὺς καταγάγοι οἴκαδε, having promised not to stop until he had restored them to their homes. Xen. An. I, 2, 2. 'Υπέσχετό μοι βουλεύτη οἰκία. Xen. Hell. V, 4, 7.

Note 3. In all the cases which belong under Note 2, the leading verb by its own signification refers to the future, so that the expression is seldom ambiguous: thus ὑπέσχετο ποιησαι can never mean anything but he promised to do, although the Aorist Infinitive appears to represent a Future Indicative of the direct discourse, contrary to § 15, 2, N. 1. The case is different, however, when the Agrist Infinitive follows verbs whose signification has no reference to the future, like νομίζω, οιομαι, or even φημί, and still appears to represent a Future Indicative; e. g. where in Arist. Nub.1141* δικάσασθαί φασί μοι is said to mean, they say they will bring an action against me, while just below, vs. 1180, θήσειν τὰ πρυτανεῖά φασί μοι means, they say they will deposit the Prytaneia. Still, unless we decide to correct a large number of passages, against the authority of the Mss. (which is actually done by many critics, especially Madvig), we must admit even this anomalous construction; although it is to be considered strictly exceptional, and is, moreover, very rare in comparison with the regular one with the Future or the Aorist with av. E. g.

Φάτο γὰρ τίσα σθαι ἀλείτας, for he said that he should punish the offenders. Od. XX, 121. (In II. III, 28, we have in most Mss. and editions φάτο γὰρ τίσεσθαι ἀλείτην, in precisely the same sense. Cf. II. III, 366.) Καὶ αὐτῷ οὐ μέμψα σθαί Απρίην (sc. ἀπεκρίνατο) · παρέσεσθαι γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ἄλλους ἄξειν, and (he answered) that Apries should not blame him; for he would not only be present himself, but would bring others. HDT. II, 162. (Notice the strange transition from the Aorist (?) to the two Futures.) Φησὶν οὐδὲ τῆν Διὸς "Εριν πέδω σκήψασαν έμποδων σχεθείν. ' ÁESCH. Sept. 429. Οἶμαι γάρ νιν ἰκετεῦσαι τάδε, I think of imploring. Eur. Iph. Aul. 462. (Here Hermann reads Ικετεύσειν, by conjecture.) Ἐνόμισαν έπιθέμενοι ράδίως κρατήσαι, they thought they should gain the victory. ΤΗ UC. ΙΙ, 3. Νομίζω, ην ίππευς γένωμαι, ἄνθρωπος πτηνός γενέσθαι. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. IV, 3, 15. Τοῦτο δὲ οἴεταί οἱ μάλιστα γενέσθαι, εἰ σοὶ συγγένοιτο, and he thinks that this would be most likely to happen to him if he should join himself with you. Plat. Prot. 316 C. (Here we should expect γενέσθαι αν, to correspond to εί συγγένοιτο.)

^{*} I find δικάσεσθαι here in Cod. Par. 2712, and by correction in 2820. (1872.)

Note 4. Verbs like $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ or $\dot{\epsilon} l \pi \sigma \nu$, when they signify to command, can be followed by the Aorist (as well as the Present) Infinitive in its ordinary sense, referring to the future; as has been stated in § 15, 2, N. 3. E. g.

 $^*\Omega$ φίλοι, ήδη μέν κεν έγων εἴποιμι καὶ ἄμμιν μνηστήρων ἐς ὅμιλον ἀκοντίσαι, now I would command you to join me in hurling, &c. Od. XXII, 262. Παραδοῦναι λέγει, he tells us to give her up. Arist. Av. 1679.

§ 24. The Aorist Participle regularly refers to a momentary or single action, which is past with reference to the time of its leading verb. E. g.

Ταῦτα ποιή σαντες ἀπελθεῖν βούλονται, having done this, they wish to go away. Ταῦτα εἰπόντες ἀπῆλθον, having said this, they went away. Οἱ πολλοὶ φαίνονται ξυνελθόντες, not many appear to have joined in the expedition. ΤΗυς Ι, 10. Βοιωτοὶ οἱ ἐξ Αρνης ἀναστάντες τὴν Βοιωτίαν ὅκησαν, Βοεοτίανς who had been driven from Arne settled Boeotia. ΤΗυς Ι, 12. Αφίκετο δεῦρο τὸ πλοῖον, γνόντων τῶν Κεφαλλήνων, ἀντιπράττοντος τούτου, . . . καταπλεῖν, the Cephallenians having determined to sail in, although this man opposed it. Dem. in Zenoth. 886, 1. (Here γνόντων denotes time past relatively to ἀφίκετο, and ἀντιπράττοντος time present relatively to γνόντων, which is its leading verb. See § 16, 1.

Note 1. When the Aorist Participle is used to contain the leading idea of the expression, with λανθάνω, to escape the notice of, τυγχάνω, to happen, and φθάνω, to get the start of (§ 112, 2), it does not denote time past with reference to the verb, but coincides with it in time. Thus ἔλαθον ἀπελθόντες means they went away secretly; οὐκ ἔφθησαν ἀπελθόντες, no soon er were they gone; ἔτυχον εἰσελθόντες, they came in by chance, or they happened to come in. E. g.

Οὐδ' ἄρα Κίρκην ἐλθόντες ἐλήθομεν, nor did we come without Circe's knowledge. Od. XII, 17. "Ελαθεν [αὐτὴν] ἀφθέντα πάντα καὶ καταφλεχθέντα, everything took fire and was consumed before she knew it. Thuc. IV, 183. "Εφθη ὁρεξάμενος, he aimed a blow first. Il. XVI, 322. Οὐ γὰρ ἔφθη μοι συμβᾶσα ἡ ἀτυχία, καὶ ἐπεχείρησαν, for no sooner did this misfortune come upon mc, than they undertook, &c. Dem. Eubul. 1319, 8. Στρατιὰ οὐ πολλὴ ἔτυχε μέχρι Ἰσθμοῦ παρελθοῦσα, an army of no great size had by chance marched as far as the Isthmus. Thuc. VI, 61. "Ετυχε δὲ κατὰ τοῦτο τοῦ καιροῦ ἐλθών, and he happened to come just at that nick of time. Id. VII, 2. 'Ολίγα πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα τυχεῖν πράξαντες (ες. ἡγοῦνται), they think they have chanced to accomplish only a little in comparison with their expectations. Id. I, 70.

Βουλοίμην ἃν λαθεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπελθών, I shoula εἶκε ιο yet αιαν without his knowing it. ΧΕΝ. Απ. I, 3, 17. Τοὺς ἀνθρώπους λήσομεν ἐπιπεσόντες. Id. VII, 3, 43. Εὐλαβεῖσθαι παρακελεύσεσθε ἀλλήλοις, μὴ πέρα τοῦ δέοντος σοφώτεροι γενόμενοι λήσετε διαφθαρέντες, lest, having become wiser than is proper, you shall become corrupted before you know it. Plat. Gorg. 487 D. (Here γενόμενοι is an ordinary Aorist, past with reference to the phrase λήσετε διαφθαρέντες.) ὑππότερός κε φθῆσιν ὁ ρεξάμενος χρόα καλόν, whichever shall first hit, &c. II. XXIII, 805.

The last four examples show that this use of the Participle was allowed even when the whole expression referred to the future.

NOTE 2. A use of the Aorist Participle similar to that noticed in Note 1 is found after περιοράω and ἐφοράω (περιείδου and ἐπείδου) to allow, and occasionally after other verbs which take the Participle in the sense of the Infinitive (§ 112, 1). In this construction the Aorist Participle seems to express merely a momentary action, the time being the same that the Aorist Infinitive would denote if it were used in its place (§ 23, 1). E. g.

Προσδεγόμενος τους 'Αθηναίους κατοκνήσειν περιιδείν αυτήν [την γην] $\tau \mu \eta \theta \in i \sigma a \nu$, $a \nu \in i \chi \in \nu$, expecting that they would be unwilling to allow their land to be ravaged, &c. THUC. II, 18. But in II, 20, we find the Aorist Infinitive, ήλπιζεν την γην οὐκ ἃν περιιδεῖν τμηθηναι, referring to precisely the same thing. Μή περιίδητε ήμέας διαφθαρένras, do not allow us to be destroyed. HDT. IV, 118. Ου μή σ' έγω περιόψομαι ἀπελθόντα, I will by no means let you go. Arist. Ran. 509. "Ετλησαν έπιδείν έρήμην μέν την πόλιν γενομένην, την δε χώραν πορθουμένην, ἄπαντα δε τον πόλεμον περί την πατρίδα την αύτων γιγνόμενον. Isoc. Pan. p. 60 D. § 96. (Here the Aorist Participle denotes the laying waste of the city (as a single act), while the Presents denote the continuous ravaging of the country, and the gradual coming on of a state of war. This is precisely the difference that there would be between the Present and Aorist Infinitive in a similar construction. See note on the passage, added to Felton's 3d ed. p. 99.) So πραθέντα τλήναι, endured to be sold. AESCH. Agam. 1041; and σπείρας έτλα, Sept. 754.

Instances occur of the Aorist Participle in this sense even with other verbs, denoting that in which the action of the verb consists; as εν γ ἐποίησας ἀναμνήσας με, you did well in reminding me.

PLAT. Phaed. 60 C. So καταψηφισάμενοι, Apol. 30 D.

REMARK. If a reference to the past is required in the Participle with the verbs mentioned in Notes 1 and 2, the Perfect is used. The Present can of course be used to denote a continued action or state. E. g.

Ἐτύγχανον άρτι παρειλη φότες την άρχην, they happened to have

iust received their authority. Thuc. VI, 96. Ἐίν τ.ς ἡδικηκώς τι τυγχάνη τὴν πόλιν. Dem. Cor. 268, 23. Ἐλάθομεν ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς παίδων οὐδεν διαφέροντες. Plat. Crit. 49 B.

Note 3. In such passages as ωμολόγησαν τοῖς 'Αθηναίοις τείχη τε περιελόντες καὶ ναῖς παραδόντες φόρον τε ταξάμενοι, Τιιυο. I, 108, the Aorist Participle is used in its ordinary sense, being past with reference to the time of the beginning of the peace to which ὁμολόγησαν refers. The meaning is, they obtained terms of peace, on condition that they should first (i. e. before the peace began) tear down their walls, &c. (Such passages are Truo. I, 101, 108, 115, 117. See Krüger's Note on I, 108, and Madvig's Bemerkungen, p. 46.)

Note 4. For the use of the Aorist Infinitive and Participle with $\tilde{a}\nu$, see § 41, 3. For the Aorist Participle with $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$, as a circumlocution for the Perfect, as $\theta a\nu\mu d\sigma as$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$, see § 112, N. 7. For the rare use of the Aorist Participle with $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma o\mu aa$ as a circumlocution for the Future Perfect, see § 29, N. 4.

FUTURE.

- § 25. 1. The Future denotes that an action will take place in time to come; as $\gamma \rho \acute{a} \psi \omega$, I shall write, or I shall be writing.
- Note 1. The action of the Future is sometimes continued, and sometimes momentary: thus $\tilde{\epsilon}\xi\omega$ may mean either I shall have, or I shall obtain; $\tilde{a}\rho\xi\omega$, I shall rule, or I shall obtain power. E. g.

Πραγματεύονται ὅπως ἄρξουσιν, they take trouble to gain power. ΧΕΝ. Rep. Laced. ΧΙV, 5. Διαιρετέον οἵτινες ἄρξουσίν τε καὶ ἄρξονται, we must distinguish between those who are to rule and those who are to be ruled. PLAT. Rep. III, 412 B.

NOTE 2. The Future is sometimes used in a *gnomic* sense, to denote that something will *always* happen when an occasion offers. E. g.

'Ανήρ ό φεύγων καὶ πάλιν μαχήσεται. MENAND. Monost. 45.

Note 3. The Future is sometimes used to express what will hereafter be proved or recognized as a truth. This is analogous to the use of the Imperfect, § 11, N. 6. E. g.

Φιλόσοφος ἡμῖν ἔσται ὁ μέλλων καλὸς κάγαθὸς ἔσεσθαι φύλαξ, he will prove to be a philosopher. Plat. Rep. II, 876 C. See Od. II. 270.

NOTE 4. The Future is sometimes used in questic is of doubt, where the Subjunctive is more common (§ 88). E. g.

Tl δητα δρώμεν; μητέρ η φονεύσομεν; what can we do? shall we kill our mother? Eur. El. 967. Ποῖ τις τρέψεται; whither shall one turn? Δ έξεσθε, η ἀπίωμεν; will you receive him, or shall we go away? Plat. Symp. 212 E. Elt έγω σου φείσομαι; Arist. Acharn. 312. Τί οὖν ποιήσομέν; πότερον εἰς τὴν πόλιν πάντας τούτους παραδεξόμεθα; what then shall we do? Are we to receive all these into the state? Plat. Rep. III, 397 D.

Note 5. (a.) The second person of the Future may express a concession, permission, or obligation, and is often a mild form of imperative. E. g.

Πρὸς ταῦτα πράξεις ςἶον ἃν θέλης, you may act as you please. Soph. O. C. 956. Πάντως δι τοῦτο δράσεις, but by all means do this. Arist. Nub. 1352. So in the common imprecations, ἀπολείσθε, οἰμόξεσθε, may you perish, &c. Χειρί δ' οὐ ψαύσεις ποτέ. Eur. Mcd. 1320.

(b.) A few instances occur in which the Future Indicative with $u\dot{\eta}$ expresses a prohibition, like the Imperative or Subjunctive with $u\dot{\eta}$ (§ 86). E. g.

Ταύτην, ἄν μοι χρῆσθε συμβούλω, φυλάξετε τὴν πίστιν, καὶ μὴ βουλήσεσθε εἰδέναι, κ. ι. λ., if you follow my advice, keep this faith, and do not wish to know, &c. ĎΕΜ. Aristoc. 659, 15. 'Εὰν δὲ εὖ φρονῆτε, καὶ νυνὶ τοῦτο φανερὸν ποιήσετε, καὶ μηδεμίαν αὐτοῖς ἄδειαν δώσετε. Lys. Phil. § 13. (In the preceding examples φυλάξετε and ποιήσετε belong under <math>a.) Καὶ τὰμὰ τεύχη μήτ' ἀγωνάρχαι τινὲς θήσου σ' 'Αχαιοῖς, μήθ' ὁ λυμεὼν ἐμός. SOPH. Aj. 572. Ξένον ἀδικήσεις μηδέποτε καιρὸν λαβών. ΜΕΝΑΝ. Μοπ. 397. So perhaps μηδὲν τῶνδ' ἐρεῖς κατὰ πτύλιν. ΑΕSCH. Sept. 250.

These examples are sometimes explained by supposing an ellipsis of $\tilde{\sigma}\pi\omega s$ from the common construction $\tilde{\sigma}\pi\omega s$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\tau o \hat{\nu} \tau o$ $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota} s$ (sc. $\sigma \kappa \delta \pi \epsilon \iota$). See § 45, N. 7.

Remark. The use of the Future stated in Note 5 gives the most satisfactory explanation of the Future with $o\dot{v}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ in prohibitions, especially in such expressions as $o\dot{v}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\lambda a\lambda\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota s$, $\lambda\dot{\lambda}\lambda\dot{\tau}$ $\dot{\alpha}\kappa\lambda o\nu$ - $\theta\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota s$ $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\mu}\dot{\epsilon}$, do not prate, but follow me, and $o\dot{v}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\dot{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota s$ $\chi\epsilon\dot{\iota}\rho a$, $\mu\dot{\eta}\dot{\delta}$ $\dot{a}\psi\epsilon\iota$ $\pi\dot{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\omega\nu$, do not bring your hand near me, nor touch my garments. See § 89, 2, with Notes.

Note 6. The Future sometimes denotes a present intention, expectation, or necessity that something shall be done, in which sense the periphrastic form with $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$ is more common. E. g.

Τί διαφέρουσι τῶν ἐξ ἀνάγκης κακοπαθούντων, εἴ γε πεινήσουσι καὶ διψήσουσι καὶ διγήσουσι καὶ ἀγρυπνήσουσιν; i. e. if they are to endure hunger and thirst, &c. Xen. Mem. II, 1, 17. (Here εἰ μέλλουσι πεινῆν καὶ διψῆν, &c. would be more common, as in the last example under § 25, 2.) Αἰρε πλῆκτρον, εἰ μαχεῖ, raiso your spur, if you are going to fight. Άλιστ. Αν. 759. The impor

tance of this distinction will be seen when we come to conditional

sentences. (See § 49, 1, N. 3.)

A still more emphatic reference to a present intention is found in the question τi $\lambda \in \xi \in \iota s$; what dost thou mean to say? often found in tragedy; as $\Omega_{\mu o i}$, τi $\lambda \in \xi \in \iota s$; $\hat{\eta}$ $\gamma a \hat{\rho}$ $\hat{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \hat{\nu} \hat{s}$ $\hat{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \hat{\iota}$ $\pi o \nu$; Eur. Elec. 1124.

- Note 7. For the Future Indicative and Infinitive with $\tilde{a}\nu$, see § 37, 2, and § 41, 4. For the Future Indicative in protasis, see § 50, 1, N. 1; in relative clauses expressing a purpose, &c., see § 65, 1 and 2; with $o\dot{v}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$, see § 89.
- 2. A periphrastic Future is formed by $\mu \in \lambda \lambda \omega$ and the Present or Future (seldom the Aorist) Infinitive. This form sometimes denotes mere futurity, and sometimes intention, expectation, or necessity. E. g.

Μέλλει τοῦτο πράττειν (or πράξειν), he is about to do this, or he intends to do this. So in Latin, facturus est for faciet. Μέλλω ὑμᾶς διδάξειν, ὅθεν μοι ἡ διαβολὴ γέγονε. Plat. Apol. 21 Β. Δεήσει τοῦ τοιούτον τινὸς ἀεὶ ἐπιστάτου, εἰ μέλλει ἡ πολιτεία σώζεσθαι, if the constitution is to be preserved. Plat. Rep. III, 412 A.

- Note 1. The Future Infinitive after $\mu i \lambda \lambda \omega$ forms the only regular exception to the general principle of the use of that tense. (See § 27, N. 1.) The Future and the Present seem to be used indiscriminately.
- Note 2. The Imperfect (seldom the Aorist) of $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ is used to express a past intention or expectation. E. g.

Κύκλωψ, οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες ἀνάλκιδος ἀνδρὸς ἐταίρους ἔδμεναι ἐν σπῆι γλαφυρῷ, you surely were not intending to eat, &c. Od. IX, 475 Έμελλόν σ' ἄρα κινήσειν ἐγώ, I thought I should start you off. Arist. Nub. 1301. See II. II. 36.

§ 26. The Future Optative in classic Greek is used only in indirect discourse after secondary tenses, to represent a Future Indicative of the direct discourse. Even here the Future Indicative is very often retained in the indirect discourse. (See § 69.) E. g.

Υπειπων τάλλα ὅτι αὐτὸς τἀκεῖ πράξοι, ῷχετο, having suggested as to what remained, that he would himself attend to the affairs there, he departed. Thuc. I, 90. (Here πράξοι represents πράξω of the direct discourse, which might have been expressed by πράξει in the indirect quotation. See in the same chapter of Thucydides, ἀποκρινάμενοι ὅτι πέμψουσιν, having τ plied that they would send,

where πεμψοιεν might have been used.) Εἴ τινα φείνοντα λήψοιτο, προηγόρευεν ὅτι ὡς πολεμίω χρήσοιτο. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. III, 1, 3. (Here the announcement was εἴ τινα λήψομαι, ὡς πολεμίω χρήσομαι.) Έλεγεν ὅτι ἔτοιμος εἴη ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς εἰς τὰ Δέλτα, ἔνθα πολλλ ἡ ψοιντο. ΧΕΝ. ΑΝ. VII, 1, 33. Αἰρεθέντες ἐψ' ὅτε ξυγγράψαι νόμους, καθ' οὕστινας πολιτεύσοιντο, having been chosen for the purpose of making a code of laws, by which they were to govern. ΧΕΝ. Hell. II, 3, 11. (Here we have an indirect expression of the idea of the persons who chose them, of which the direct form is found just before (II, 3, 2), ἔδοξε τριάκοντα ἄνδρας ἐλέσθαι, οῖ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους ξυγγράψουσι, καθ' οῦς πολιτεύσουσι.)

Remark. The term indirect discourse here, as elsewhere, must be understood to include, not only all cases of ordinary indirect quotation, introduced by 5rt or 5s or by the Accusative and the Infinitive, after verbs of saying and thinking, but also all dependent clauses, in any sentence, which indirectly express the thoughts of any other person than the writer or speaker, or even former thoughts of the speaker himself. (See § 68.)

- Note 1. The Future Optative is sometimes used in final and object clauses after secondary tenses; but regularly only with $\delta \pi \omega_s$ or $\delta \pi \omega_s$ $\mu \dot{\eta}$ after verbs of *striving*, &c., occasionally with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ (or $\delta \pi \omega_s$ $\mu \dot{\eta}$) after verbs of *fearing*, and very rarely (if ever) in pure final clauses. As these clauses express the purpose or fear of some *person*, they are in indirect discourse according to the Remark above. (See § 44, 2.)
 - (a.) The most common case of the Future Optative in sentences of this class is with ὅπως or ὅπως μή after secondary tenses of verbs signifying to strive, to take care, and the like; the Future Indicative in this case being the most common form in the construction after primary tenses, which here corresponds to the direct discourse. Thus, if any one ever said or thought, σκοπῶ ὅπως τοῦτο γενήσεται, I am taking care that this shall happen, we can now say, referring to that thought, ἐσκόπει ὅπως τοῦτο γενήσοιτο, he was taking care that this should happen, changing the Future Indicative to the Future Optative (§ 77). E. g.

Έσκόπει ὁ Μενεκλῆς ὅπως μὴ ἔσοιτο ἄπαις, ἀλλ' ἔσοιτο αὐτῷ ὅστις ζῶντά τε γηροτροφήσοι καὶ τελευτήσαντα θάψοι αὐτὸν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον τὰ νομιζόμενα αὐτῷ ποιήσοι. ISAE. de Menecl. Hered. § 10 (11). Ἐμηχανώμεθα ὅπως μηδείς... γνώσοιτο, νομιοῦσι δὲ πάντες, κ. τ. λ., νω were striving that no one should know, &c., but that all should think, &c. Plat. Tim. 18 C (Here the second verb, νι μιοῦσι, is retained in the Future Indica

tive, while the other, γνώσεται, is changed to the Optative.) See also Plat. Tim. 18 E. Μηδέν οἴου ἄλλο μηχανᾶσθαι, ἢ ὅπως . . . δ έ ξοιντο. Plat. Rep. IV, 430 A. (See § 15, 3.) Ἐπεμελεῖτο δὲ ὅπως μήτε ἄσιτοι μήτε ἄποτοί ποτε ἔσοιντο. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 1, 43. Other examples are Plat. Apol. 36 C; XΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 1, 10, Hell. VII, 5, 3; ISAE. de Philoct. Hered. p. 59, 41. § 35.

In this construction the Future Indicative is generally retained,

even after secondary tenses. See § 45.

(b.) The Future Optative is seldom found with $\mu\dot{\eta}$ or $\ddot{\omega}\pi\omega s$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ after secondary tenses of verbs of fearing, as here the Future Indicative is not common after primary tenses. E. g.

Οὐ μόνον περὶ τῆς βασάνου καὶ τῆς δίκης ἐδεδοίκει, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ γραμματείου, ὅπως μὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μενεξένου συλληφθήσοιτο. Isoc. Trapez. p. 363 B. § 22. (Here the fear was expressed originally by ὅπως μὴ συλληφθήσεται.) Κατέβαλε τὸ Ἡρακλεωτῶν τείχος, οὐ τοῦτο φοβούμενος, μὴ τινες πορεύσοιντο ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκείνου δύναμιν. ΧΕΝ. Hell. VI, 4, 27. ᾿Αλλὰ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀν ἔδεισας παρακινδυνεύειν, μὴ οὐκ ὀρθῶς αὐτὸ ποιήσοις. PLAT. Euthyphr. 15 D.

Here the Present or Aorist Optative, corresponding to the same tenses of the Subjunctive after primary tenses, is generally used.

See § 46.

(c.) In pure Final clauses (§ 44, 1) it would be difficult to find an example of $\delta\pi\omega s$ with the Future Optative, in which the weight of Mss. authority did not favor some other reading. Such is the case in Xen. Cyr. V, 4, 17, and in Dem. Phaenipp. 1040, 20. Still, there can be little doubt of the propriety of such a construction, as the Future Indicative with $\delta\pi\omega s$ was in use (though rare) after

primary tenses. (§ 44, 1, N. 1.)

The single example cited for the use of the simple μή with the Future Optative in a pure final clause is Plat. Rep. III, 393 Ε: Αγαμέμνων ἡγρίαινεν, ἐντελλόμενος νῦν τε ἀπιέναι καὶ αὐθις μὴ ἐλθοῦν, μὴ ἀλτῷ τό τε σκῆπτρον καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ στέμματα οὐκ ἐπαρκέσοι. (Here there is another reading, ἐπαρκέσειεν, of inferior authority, which is adopted by Bekker.) If the reading ἐπαρκέσοι is retained (as it is by most editors), it can be explained only by assuming that Plato had in his mind as the direct discourse μὴ οὐκ ἐπαρκέσει. We must remember that Plato is here paraphrasing Homer (II. I, 25-28), and by no means literally. The Homeric line is Μή νύ τοι οὐ χραίσμη σκῆπτρον καὶ στέμμα θεοῖο.

The other final particles, "va and os, which seem never to take the Future Indicative, of course do not allow the Future Optative.

(See § 44, 1, N 1.)

Note 2. Many authors, especially Thucydides, show a decided preference for the Future Indicative, even where the Future Optative might be used. As the tense was restricted to indirect dis-

course, it was a less common form than the Present and Aorist, and for that reason often avoided even when it was allowed.

§ 27. The Future Infinitive denotes an action which is future with reference to the leading verb. E. g.

"Εσεσθαί φησι, he says that he will be; εσεσθαι εφη, he said that he would be; εσεσθαι φήσει, he will say that he will be. Πολλούς γε εσεσθαι ελεγον τους εθελήσοντας, they said that there would be many who would be willing. XEN. Cyr. III, 2, 26.

Note 1. The most common use of the Future Infinitive is in indirect discourse, after verbs of saying, thinking, &c., to represent a Future Indicative of the direct discourse. (See the examples above.) In other constructions, the Present and Aorist Infinitive, being indefinite in their time, can always refer to the future if the context requires it (§§ 15, 1; 23, 1); so that it is seldom necessary to use the Future, unless emphasis is particularly required.

Therefore, after verbs and expressions whose signification refers a dependent Infinitive to the future, but which yet do not introduce indirect discourse, as verbs of commanding, wishing, &c. (§ 15, 2, N. 1), the Present or Aorist Infinitive (not the Future) is regularly used. Thus the Greek would express they wish to do this not by βούλονται τοῦτο ποιήσειν, but by βούλονται τοῦτο ποιεῖν (οr ποιῆσαι). See examples under §§ 15, 1 and 23, 1. So, when the Infinitive follows &στε and other particles which refer it to the future, or is used to denote a purpose without any particle (§ 97),—and when it is used as a noun with the article, even if it refers to future time,—it is generally in the Present or Aorist, unless it is intended to make the reference to the future especially emphatic. See examples in Chapter V.

A single regular exception to this principle is found in the Future Infinitive after $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$ (§ 25, 2).

Note 2. On the other hand, when it was desired to make the reference to the future especially prominent, the Future Infinitive could be used in the cases mentioned in Note 1, contrary to the general principle.

(a.) Thus we sometimes find the Future Infinitive after

verbs and expressions signifying to wish, to be unwilling, to intend, to ask, to be able, and the like, where we should expect the Present or Aorist. This was particularly a favorite construction with Thucydides. E. g.

'Εδεήθησαν δε καὶ τῶν Μεγαρέων ναυσὶ σφᾶς ξυμπροπέμψειν ΤΗυς. Ι, 27. Έβούλοντο προτιμωρήσεσθαι. Id. VI, 57. Το στόμα αὐτοῦ διενοοῦντο κλή σειν. Ιd. VII, 56. Ἐφιέμενοι μὲν τῆς πάσης ἄρξειν, βοηθείν δε θμα εὐπρεπῶς βουλόμενοι τοῖς έαυτῶν ξυγγενέσι καὶ ξυμμάχοις. Id. VI, 6. (Here βοηθείν follows the rule.) Τοῦ ταις ναυσὶ μη άθυμειν έπιχειρήσειν, to prevent them from being without spirit to attack them in ships. Id. VII, 21. Ούτ' ἀποκωλύσειν δύνατοι όντες. Id. III, 28. Εί τις είς τοῦτο αναβάλλεται ποιήσειν τὰ δέοντα, if any one postpones doing his duty as far as this. DEM. Ol. III, 31, 1. (The ordinary construction would be ἀναβάλλεται ποιείν οτ ποιήσαι.) Οὔτε τῶν προγόνων μεμνήσθαι [δεί] οὔτε των λεγόντων ανέχεσθαι, νόμον τε θήσειν καὶ γράψειν, κ. τ. λ. DEM. F. L. 345, 27. (Here we have δεί θήσειν.) Πολλοῦ δέω έμαυτόν γε άδική σειν και κατ' έμαυτοῦ έρειν αὐτός. PLAT. Apol. 37 B. In Arist. Nub. 1130 we find, ίσως βουλήσεται καν έν Αἰγύπτω τυχείν ὧν μᾶλλον ἢ κρίναι κακώς, perhaps he will wish that he might (if possible) find himself by some chance in Egypt, rather than wish to judge unfairly. (Here Tuxeîv av is used in nearly the same sense as the Future in the second example. In this example and some others here given there seems to be an approach to the construction of indirect discourse.)

See also Thuc. IV, 115 and 121; V, 35; VII, 11; VIII, 55 and 74. In several of these passages the Mss. vary between the Future and Aorist, although the weight of authority is for the Future. See Krüger's Note on Thuc. I, 27, where the passages of Thucydides

are collected.

(b.) In like manner, the Future Infinitive is occasionally used for the Present or Aorist, after $\omega_{\sigma\tau\epsilon}$ and in the other constructions mentioned in Note 1, to make the idea of futurity more prominent. E. g.

Προκαλεσάμενος ἐς λόγους Ἱππίαν, ὥστε ἢν μηδὲν ἀρέσκον λέγη, πάλιν αὐτὸν καταστήσειν ἐς τὸ τείχος on condition that he would in that case restore him. Thuc. III, 34. Τοὺς ὁμήρους παρέδοσαν τῷ ᾿Αργείων δήμφ διὰ ταῦτα διαχρήσεσθαι, IIα, 26. Ἦλπίδι τὸ ἀφανὲς τοῦ κατορθώσειν ἐπιτρέψαντες, having committed to hope what was uncertain in the prospect of success. Thuc. II, 42. (Here κατορθώσειν is more explicit than the Present κατορθοῦν would be τὸ ἀφανὲς τοῦ κατορθοῦν would mean simply what was uncertain in regard to success.) Τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐξελέγξειν αὐτὸν θαρρφ καὶ πάνν πιστενφ, I have courage and great confidence as to my convicting him. Dem. F. L. 342, 2. (Here most of the ordinary Mss. read ἐξελέγχειν.)

NOTE 3. The Future Infinitive is the regular form after verbs of hoping, expecting, promising, &c., since it stands here in indirect discourse (§ 15, 2, N. 1). E. g.

Τρωσὶν δ' ἔλπετο θυμὸς νῆας ἐνιπρήσειν κτενέειν θ' ῆρωας Αχαιούς. II. XV, 701. 'Υπό τ' ἔσχετο καὶ κατένευσεν δωσέμεναι. II. XIII, 368 Παίδά τε σὸν προσδόκα τοι ἀπονοστήσειν. ΗDT. I, 42. Καὶ προσδοκὰν χρὴ δεσπόσειν Ζηνός τινα; ΑΕSCΗ. Prom. 930. "Ηλπιζεν γὰρ μάχην ἔσεσθαι. ΤΠΟΙ. IV, 71. 'Εν ἐλπίδι ῶν τὰ τείχη αἰρήσειν. Id. VII, 46. Τὸν στρατηγὸν προσδοκῶ ταῦτα πράξειν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. III, 1, 14. 'Εκ τούτου ὑπέσχετο μηχανὴν παρέξειν. Id. Cyr. VI, 1, 21. Σὸ γὰρ ὑπέσχου ζητήσειν. PLAT. Rep. IV, 427 E. Sο διώμοτοι ἢ μὴν ἄξειν, SOPH. Phil. 594.

Yet all of these verbs can take the Aorist or Present Infinitive without apparent change of meaning. They form an intermediate class between verbs which take the Infinitive in indirect discourse and those which do not. For examples of the Present and Aorist, see § 15, 2, N. 2; and § 23, 2, N. 2.

§ 28. The Future Participle denotes an action which is future with reference to the leading verb. E. g.

Τοῦτο ποιήσων ξρχεται, ήλθεν οτ ελεύσεται, he comes, went, or will come, for the purpose of doing this. Οίδα αὐτὸν τοῦτο ποιήσοντα, I know that he will do this: οίδα τοῦτο ποιήσων, I know that I shall do this. So ήδειν αὐτὸν τοῦτο ποιήσοντα, I knew that he would do this.

Note. For the various uses of the Future Participle, and examples, see Chapter VI.

FUTURE PERFECT.

§ 29. The Future Perfect denotes that an action will be already finished at some future time. It is thus a Perfect transferred to the future. E. g.

Καί με ἐὰν ἐξελέγξης, οὐκ ἀχθεσθήσομαί σοι, ἀλλὰ μέγιστος εὐεργέτης παρ' ἐμοὶ ἀναγεγράψει, you will have been enrolled as the greatest benefactor. Plat. Gorg. 506 C. *Ην δὲ μὴ γένηται, μάτην ἐμοὶ κεκλαύσεται, σὰ δ' ἐγχανὼν τεθνήξεις. I shall then have had my whipping for nothing, and you will have died. Arist. Nub. 1435

NOTE 1. The Future Perfect often denotes the contin

uance of an action, or the permanence of its results, in future time. E. g.

Της δυνάμεως ε'ς δίδιον τοις επιγιγνομένοις μνήμη καταλελείου τοις επιγιγνομένοις μνήμη καταλελείου τοις et aι, the memory of our power will be left to our posterity forever. Thuc. II, 64. (Compare § 18, 2.)

NOTE 2. The Future Perfect sometimes denotes the certainty or likelihood that an action will *immediately* take place, which idea is still more vividly expressed by the Perfect (§ 17, Note 6). E. g.

Εὶ δὲ παρελθών εἶς ὁστισοῦν δύναιτο διδάξαι, πᾶς ὁ παρὸν φόβος $\lambda \in \lambda \acute{\nu} \sigma \in \tau \alpha \imath$, all the present fear will be at once dispelled. Dem. Symmor. 178, 17. (Here the inferior Mss. have $\lambda \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \nu \tau \alpha \iota$, which would have the same force, like ὅλωλα quoted in § 17, N. 6.) Φράζε, καὶ $\pi \in \pi \rho \acute{\alpha} f \in \tau \alpha \iota$, speak, and it shall be no sooner said than done. ARIST. Plut. 1027. Εὐθις ᾿Αριαῖος ἀφεστήξει, ὥστε φίλος ἡμῖν οὐδεὶς $\lambda \in \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \iota \psi \in \tau \alpha \iota$. XEN. An. II, 4, 5.

Note 3. The Future Perfect can be expressed by the Perfect Participle and ἔσομαι. In the active voice this compound form is the only one in use, except in a few verbs E. g.

*Aν ταῦτ' εἰδῶμεν, καὶ τὰ δέοντα ἐσόμεθα ἐγνωκότες καὶ λόγων ματαίων ἀπηλλαγμένοι, we shall have already resolved to do our duty and shall have been freed from vain reports. Dem. Phil. I, 54, 22. (See § 17, N. 2).

Note 4. A circumlocation with the Aorist Participle and $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\mu$ a is sometimes found, especially in the poets. E. g.

Οὖ σιωπήσας ἔσει; SOPH. O. T. 1146. Αυπηθεὶς ἔσει. SOPH. O. C. 816.

NOTE 5. (a.) When the Perfect is used in the sense of a Present (§ 17, N. 3), the Future Perfect is the regular Future of that tense. E. g.

Κεκλήσομαι, μεμνήσομαι, ἀφεστήξω, I shall be named, I shall rember, I shall withdraw, &c.

(b.) With many other verbs, the Future Perfect differs very slightly, if at all, from an ordinary Future. Thus, $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \acute{a} \sigma \omega \mu a\iota$ is the regular Future Passive of $\pi \iota \pi \rho \acute{a} \sigma \kappa \omega$. Still, where there is another form, the Future Perfect is generally more emphatic, and may be explained by Note 1 or Note 2.

NOTE 6. The Future Perfect of the dependent moods is rare, except in the verbs referred to in Note 5. When it occurs, it presents no peculiarity, as it bears the same relation to the Indicative which the corresponding forms of the Future would bear. L. g.

Ταῦτα (φησί) $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \dot{a} \xi \epsilon \sigma \theta a$ ι δυοΐν ή τριῶν ήμερῶν, he says that these things will have been accomplished within two or three days. Dem. F. L. 364, 18. (Here the direct discourse was $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \dot{a} \xi \epsilon \tau a$)

REMARK. It must be remembered that, in most cases in which the Latin or the English would use a Future Perfect, the Greeks use an Aorist or even Perfect Subjunctive. (See § 18, 1, and § 20, N. 1, with the examples.)

GNOMIC AND ITERATIVE TENSES.

§ 30. 1. The Aorist and sometimes the Perfect Indicative are used in animated language to express general truths. These are called the gnomic Aorist and the gnomic Perfect, and are usually to be translated by our Present.

These tenses give a more vivid statement of general truths, by employing a distinct case or several distinct cases in past time to represent (as it were) all possible cases, and implying that what has occurred will occur again under similar circumstances. E. g.

Κάτθαν' όμως ο τ' ἀεργὸς ἀνηρ ο τε πολλά ἐοργώς, both alike must die. Il. IX, 320. "Οστε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἄνδρα φοβεῖ καὶ ἀφείλετο νίκην, who terrifies, and snatches away. Il. XVII, 177. (See Note 2.) Βία δὲ καὶ μεγάλαυχον ἔσφαλεν ἐν χρόνω. PIND. Pyth. VIII, 20. Σοφοί δε μελλοντα τριταίον άνεμον έμαθον, οὐδ' ὑπὸ κέρδει βλάβεν. PIND. Nem. VII, 25. Καὶ δὴ φίλον τις ἔκταν ἀγνοίας ὕπο. ΑΕSCH. 'Αλλὰ τὰ τοιαῦτα εἰς μὲν ἄπαξ καὶ βραχὺν χρόνον Supp. 499. ἀντέχει, καὶ σφόδρα γε ήνθησεν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐλπίσιν, ἃν τύχη, τῷ χρόνω δέ φωράται καὶ περὶ αύτὰ καταρρεῖ. Dem. Ol. II, 21, 1. (See Note 2.) *Ην ἄρα σφαλώσιν, ἀντελπίσαντες ἄλλα ἐπλήρωσαν την χρείαν, they supply the deficiency (as often as one occurs). ΤΗUC. I, 70. *Ην δέ τις τούτων τι παραβαίνη, ζημίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπέ- $\theta \in \sigma a \nu$, i. e. they impose a penalty upon every one who transgresses. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. Ι, 2, 2. Δεινών τ' άημα πνευμάτων έκοίμισε στένοντα πόντου. Soph. Aj. 674. Μ΄ ἡμέρα τὸν μὲν καθεῖλεν ὑψόθεν, τὸν δ' ἦρ' ἄνω. Eur. Ino Fr. 424. "Όταν ὁ "Ερως ἐγκρατέστερος γένηται, διαφθείρει τε πολλά καὶ ἡδίκησεν. PLAT. Symp. 188 A. "Όταν τις ώσπερ ούτος ἰσχύση, ἡ πρώτη πρόφασις καὶ μικρὸν πταίσμα ἄπαντα ανεχαίτισε καὶ διέλυσεν. DEM. Ol. II, 20, 27. Επειδάν τις παρ' εμοῦ μάθη, εὰν μεν βούληται, ἀποδέδωκεν ὁ εγώ πράττομαι ἀργύριον, εὰν δὲ μὴ, ελθών εἰς ἱερὸν ὀμόσας, ὅσου αν Φῃ ἄξια εἰναι τὰ μαθήματα, τοσούτον κατέθηκεν. PLAT. Prot. 328 B. (Here the Perfect and Aorist are used together, in nearly the same sense, he pays.) Πολλοί διὰ δόξαν καὶ πολιτικὴν δύναμιν μεγάλα κακὰ πεπάνθα

σιν, i.e. many always have suffered, and many do suffer. ΧΕΝ. Μεπ. IV, 2, 35. Τὸ δὲ μὴ ἐμποδων ἀνανταγωνίστω εὐνοία τετί μηται. ΤΗUC. II, 45.

REMARK. The gnomic Perfect is not found in Homer.

Note 1. The sense, as well as the origin of the construction, is often made clearer by the addition of such words as $\pi \circ \lambda \lambda \lambda \kappa \iota s$, $\eta \delta \eta$, or $\circ \tilde{\iota} \pi \omega$. Such examples as these form a simple transition from the common to the gnomic use of these tenses:—

Πολλὰ στρατόπεδα ἤδη ἔπεσεν ὑπ' ἐλασσόνων, i. e. many cases have already arisen, implying, it often happens. Thuc. II, 89. Μέλλων γ' ἰατρὸς, τῆ νόσω διδοὺς χρόνον, ἰάσατ' ἤδη μᾶλλον ἢ τεμὼν χρόα. Eur. Frag. 1057. Πολλάκις ἔχων τις οὐδὲ τὰναγκῶα νὺν αὔριον ἐπλούτησ', ἄστε χάτέρους τρέφειν, i. e. cases have often occurred in which such a man has become rich the next day, &c. Philem. Fr. Inc. 29. ᾿Αθυμοῦντες ἄνδρες οὔπω τρόπαιον ἔστησαν. Plat. Crit. 108 C. Οὐδεὶς ἐπλούτησεν ταχέως δίκαιος ὧν. ΜεΝΑΝΟ. Col. Fr. 6. (Krüger, § 53, 10, A. 2.)

Note 2. General truths are more commonly expressed in Greek, as in English, by the Present. (See § 10, N. 1.) Examples of the Present and Aorist, used in nearly the same sense in the same sentence, are given under § 30, 1. The gnomic Aorist is, however, commonly distinguished from the Present, either by being more vivid, or by referring to an action which is (by its own nature) momentary or sudden, while the Present (as usual) implies duration. See the second and sixth examples under § 30, 1.

Note 3. An Aorist resembling the gnomic Aorist is very common in Homer, in *similes* depending on past tenses, where it seems to stand by assimilation to the leading verb. It is usually to be translated by the Present. E. g.

"Hριπε δ' ώς ὅτε τις δρῦς ἥριπεν, and he fell, as when an oak falls (literally, as when an oak once fell). Il. XVI, 389.

Note 4. It is very doubtful whether the Imperfect was ever used in a gnomic sense, so as to be translated by the Present.

Note 5. An instance of the gnomic Aorist in the Infinitive 1s found in Soph. Aj: 1082:—

"Όπου δ' ὑβρίζειν δρᾶν θ', ἃ βούλεται, παρῆ, Ταύτην νόμιζε τὴν πόλιν χρόνω ποτε 'Εξ οὐρίων δραμοῦσαν ἐς βυθὸν π ε σ εῖν.

Here $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \tilde{\nu}$ represents $\tilde{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$ in the direct discourse; the sense being, believe that that city must at some time fall. (See Schneidewin's note.) So probably in PLAT. Phaedr. 232 B: ήγουμένω διαφοράς γενομένης κοινήν αμφοτέροις καταστήναι την συμφοράν.

Even the Aorist Participle seems to be occasionally used in the same sense; as in Thuc. VI, 16: οίδα τοὺς τοιούτους ἐν μὲν τῶ κατ' αὐτοὺς βίω λυπηροὺς ὄντας, των δὲ ἔπειτα ἀνθρώπων προσποίησιν Ευγγενείας τισί και μη οδοαν καταλιπόντας, I know that such men, although in their own lifetimes they are offensive, yet often leave to some who come after them a desire to claim connexion with them, even where there is no ground for it.

- Note 6. The gnomic Perfect is found in the Infinitive in Dem. ΟΙ. ΙΙ, 23, 14: εὶ δέ τις σώφρων ἡ δίκαιος, παρεώσθαι καὶ èν οὐδενὸς εἶναι μέρει τὸν τοιοῦτον (φησίν), such a man is always thrust aside, and is of no account.
- 2. The Imperfect and Aorist are sometimes used with the particle av to denote a customary action, being equivalent to our phrase in narration, "he would often do this," or "he used to do it." E. g.

Διηρώτων αν αὐτοὺς τί λέγοιεν, I used to ask them (I would ask them) what they said. PLAT. Apol. 22 B. Εί τινες ιδοιέν πη τους σφετέρους επικρατούντας, ανεθάρσησαν αν, whenever any saw their friends in any way victorious, they would be encouraged (i. e. they were encouraged in all such cases). THUC VII, 71. Πολλάκις ήκούταμεν αν τι κακώς ύμας βουλευσάμενους μέγα πράγμα, we used very often to hear you, &c. ARIST. Lysist. 511. Εί τις αὐτῶ περί του αντιλέγοι μηδεν έχων σαφες λέγειν, έπι την υπόθεσιν επανηγεν αν πάντα τὸν λόγον, he always brought the whole discussion back to the main point. XEN. Mem. IV, 6, 13. 'Οπότε προσβλέψειέ τινας τῶν ἐν ταις τάξεσι, τοτὲ μὲν εἶπεν ἄν, ὦ ἄνδρες, κ. τ. λ. τοτὲ δ' αν ἐν αλλοις αν έλεξεν. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VII, 1, 10.

This construction must be carefully distinguished from that with $\tilde{a}\nu$ in ordinary apodosis (§ 49, 2). For the iterative Imperfect transferred to the Infinitive, see § 41, N. 3.

NOTE 1. (a.) The Ionic iterative Aorist in - or and -σκόμην expresses the repetition of a momentary action; the Imperfect with the same endings expresses the repetition of a continued action. E. g.

"Αλλους μέν γὰρ παίδας έμοὺς πόδας ἀκὺς 'Αχιλλεὺς πέρνασχ', ὅν τιν' ελεσκε. Π. ΧΧΙΥ, 751. Όκως ελθοι ο Νείλος επὶ όκτω πήχεας, ἄρδεσκε Αίγυπτον την ένερθε Μέμφιος. HDT. II, 13.

(b.) In Homer, however, the iterative forms are sometimes used in nearly or quite the same sense as the ordinary forms; thus core in Homer does not differ from qu.

Δαὴρ αὖτ' ἐμὸς ἔσκε κυνώπιδος, εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε. Π. ΠΠ, 180. "Os οἰ τλησίον ζε, μάλιστα δέ μιν φιλέεσκεν. Od. VII, 171.

Note 2. Herodotus sometimes uses the iterative forms in $-\sigma\kappa\sigma\nu$ and $-\sigma\kappa\delta\mu\eta\nu$ with $\tilde{a}\nu$, in the construction of § 30, 2. (He uses the Lerative Acrist in only two passages, in both with $\tilde{a}\nu$.) E. g.

Φοιτέουσα κλαίεσκε αν καὶ όδυρέσκετο. Η DT. III, 119. "Ες τούτους δκως έλθοι ό Σκύλης, τὴν μέν στρατιὴν καταλείπεσκε έν τῷ τροαστείᾳ, ιὐτὸς δὲ ὅκως ἔλθοι ἐς τὸ τεῖχος...λάβεσκε αν Έλληνίδα ἐσλῆτα. Η DT. IV, 78.

DEPENDENCE OF MOODS AND TENSES.

§ 31. 1. In dependent sentences, where the construction allows either a Subjunctive or an Optative, the Subjunctive is used if the leading verb is *primary*, and the Optative if it is *secondary*. (See § 8, 2.) E. g.

Πράττουσιν ἃ ἃν βούλωνται, they do whatever they please: but ἔπραττον ἃ βούλοιντο, they did whatever they pleased.

2. In like manner, where the construction allows either an Indicative or an Optative, the Indicative follows *primary*, and the Optative follows *secondary* tenses. E. g.

Λέγουσιν ὅτι τοῦτο βούλονται, they say that they wish for this, ἔλεξαν ὅτι τοῦτο βούλοιντο, they said that they wished for this.

Note 1. To these fundamental rules we find one special exception:—

In indirect discourse of all kinds (including sentences denoting a purpose or object after iva, $\mu \dot{\eta}$, &c.), either an Indicative or a Subjunctive may depend upon a secondary tense, in order that the mood and tense actually used by the speaker may be retained in the indirect discourse. (See § 69.) E. g.

Εἶπεν ὅτι βούλεται, for εἶπεν ὅτι βούλοιτο, he said that he wished (i. e. he said βούλομαι). Ἐφοβεῖτο μὴ τοῦτο γένηται, for ἐφοβεῖτο μὴ τοῦτο γένοιτο, he feared lest it should happen (i. e. he thought, φοβοῦμαι μὴ γένηται). (See § 44, 2.)

Note. 2. An only apparent exception to these rules occurs when either an apodosis with $\tilde{a}\nu$, or a verb expressing a wish, stands in a dependent sentence. In both these cases the form which would

have been required in the apodosis or in the wish, if it had been independent, is retained without regard to the leading verb. It will be obvious from the principles of such sentences (Chapter IV), that a change of mood would in most cases change the whole nature of the apodosis or wish. E. g.

Έγὼ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἄν τις σαφέστερον ἐπιδείξειεν, I do not know how any one could show this more clearly. Dem. Aph. I, 828, 23. Δεῖ γὰρ ἐκείνφ τοῦτο ἐν τῆ γνώμη παραστῆσαι, ὡς ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῆς ἀμελείας ταύτης ἴσως ἃν ὁρμήσαιτε. Dem. Phil. I, 44, 25. Εὶ δ' ὑμεῖς ἄλλο τι γνώσεσθε, ὁ μὴ γένοιτο, τίνα οἴεσθε αὐτὴν ψυχὴν ἔξειν; Dem. Aph. II, 842, 14.

The learner needs only to be warned not to attempt to apply the

rules § 31, 1, 2 to such cases as these. See § 44, 1, \hat{N} . 3 (b).

NOTE 3. A few other unimportant exceptions will be noticed as they occur. See, for example, § 44, 2, Note 2.

REMARK. It is therefore of the highest importance to ascertain which tenses (in all the moods) are to be considered primary, and which secondary; that is, which are to be followed, in dependent sentences, by the Indicative or Subjunctive, and which by the Optative, where the rules of § 31 are applied. The general principle, stated in § 8, 2, applies chiefly to the Indicative, and even there not without some important modifications.

- § 32. 1. In the Indicative the general rule holds, that the Present, Perfect, Future, and Future Perfect are primary tenses, and the Imperfect, Pluperfect, and Aorist are secondary tenses.
- 2. But the historical Present is a secondary tense, as it refers to the past; and the gnomic Aorist is a primary tense, as it refers to the present.

See the first example under § 10, 2, where an historical Present is followed by the Optative; and the sixth, seventh, and eighth examples under § 30, 1, where gnomic Aorists are followed by the Subjunctive.

3. (a.) The Imperfect Indicative in protasis or apodosis denoting the non-fulfilment of a condition (§ 49, 2), when it refers to present time, is a primary tense. E. g.

"Εγραφον ἃν ήλίκα ὑμᾶς εὖ ποι ήσω, εἰ εὖ ήδειν, I would tell you in my letter how great services I would render you, if I knew, &c Dem. F. L. 353, 24. Πάνυ ἃν ἐφοβούμην, μὴ ἀπορήσωσι λόγων. ΥιΑΤ. Symp. 193 Ε. Ἐφοβούμην ἃν σφόδρα λέγειν, μὴ δάξω, κ. τ. λ., I should be very much afraid to speak, lest I should seem, &c. PLAT. Theaet. 143 Ε. Ταῦτ' ἃν ήδη λέγειν ἐπεχείρουν, ἵν εἰδῆτε Dem. Aristocr. 623, 11.

3

(b.) On the other hand, the Aorist Indicative in the same sense in protasis and apodosis, and also the Imperfect when it refers to the past, are secondary tenses. E. g.

'Αλλὰ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἃν ἔδεισας παρακινδυνεύειν, μὴ οὐκ ὀρθῶς αὐτὸ ποιήσοις. Plat. Euthyph. 15 D. 'Αλλ' οὐδὲ μετὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων ἀποδιδοὺς εἰκῆ τις ἃν ἐπίστευεν, ἵν' εἴ τις γίγνοιτο διαφορὰ, κομίσασθαι ῥαδίως παρ' ὑμῖν δύνηται. Dem. Onet. I, 869, 18. (Here the Subjunctive δύνηται will be explained by § 44, 2, but the Optative shows that the leading verb is secondary.)*

§ 33. All the tenses of the Subjunctive and Imperative are primary, as they refer to present or future time. E. g.

"Επεσθ' ὅπη ἄν τις ἡγῆται, follow whithersoever any one leads the way. Thuc. II, 11.

§ 34. As the Optative refers sometimes to the future and sometimes to the past, it exerts upon a dependent verb sometimes the force of a primary, and sometimes that of a secondary tense.

When it refers to the past, as in general suppositions after ϵl and relatives, depending on past tenses (§§ 51 and 62), it is of course secondary, like any other form which refers to past time.

When it refers to the *future*, it is properly to be considered primary. In many cases, however, a double construction is allowed: on the principle of assimilation the Greeks preferred the Optative to the Subjunctive in certain clauses depending

* It is difficult to determine the question whether the secondary tenses of the Indicative in this construction (§ 32, 3) are primary or secondary in their effect on the dependent verb, as sentences of nearly every class depending upon them take by assimilation a secondary tense of the Indicative. (So in most final clauses, § 44, 3; in protasis after ei, § 49, 2; and after relatives, § 64.) There remain only indirect quotations, and the few cases of final clauses that do not take the Indicative by assimilation; but both of these have the peculiarity of allowing the Indicative and Subjunctive, when the writer pleases, to stand as they were in the direct discourse, instead of being changed to the Optative. Madvig (Bemerkungen, p. 20) classes them all as primary forms, considering the two examples of the Optative after the Aorist, quoted above, § 32, 3 (b), as exceptions. But these cannot be accounted for on the supposition that both Aorist and Imperfect are primary: they are, however, perfectly regular, if we consider the present forms primary and the past forms secondary (as in other enses); while the other examples in which the Indicative or Subjunctive follows the past forms may all be explained on the principle of § 31, Note 1.

on an Optative, the dependent verb referring to the future like the leading verb, and differing little from a Subjunctive in such a position. This assimilation takes place regularly in protasis and conditional relative clauses depending on an Optative; but seldom in final and object clauses after τνα, ὅπως, μή. &c., and very rarely in indirect quotations or questions.

The three classes of sentences which may depend on an Optative referring to the future are treated separately:—

1. (a.) In protasis and in conditional relative sentences depending upon an Optative which refers to the future, the Optative is regularly used to express a future condition, rather than the Subjunctive. E. g.

Εἴης φορητὸς οὐκ ἃν, εἰ πράσσοις καλῶς, you would be unendurable, if you should ever prosper. Aesch. Prom. 979. ᾿Ανδρὶ δέ κ᾽ οὐκ εἰξειε μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αίας, δς θυητός τ᾽ εἰη καὶ εκδοι Δημήτερος κατήν. Π. ΧΙΙΙ, 321. Πῶς γὰρ ἄν τις, ἄ γε μὴ ἐπίσταιτο, ταῦτα σοφὸς εἰη; for how should any one be wise in those things which he did not understand? ΧΕΝ. Μεπ. IV, 6, 7. Δέοιτο ἃν αὐτοῦ μένειν, ἔστε σὰ ἀπέλθοις. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. V, 3, 13. Εὶ ἀποθυήσκοι μὲν πάντα, ὅσα τοῦ ζῆν μεταλάβοι, ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀποθάνοι, μένοι ἐν τούτφ. . . . δρ' οὐ πολλὴ ἀνάγκη τελευτῶντα πάντα τεθνάναι; Plat. Phaed. 72 C. 'Ως ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος, ὅ τις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι, may any other man likewise perish, who shall do such things. Od. I, 47. Τεθναίην, ὅτε μοι μηκέτι ταῦτα μέλοι, may I die, when I (shall) no longer care for these! ΜΙΜΝ. Fr. I, 2. (Here ὅταν μηκέτι μέλη might be used without change of meaning. But ὅτε μέλει, found in the passage as quoted by Plutarch, would refer to the present in classic Greek.)

(b.) On the other hand, the dependent verb is sometimes in the Subjunctive (or Future Indicative with ϵi), on the ground that it follows a tense of future time. This happens especially after the Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ used in its sense approaching that of the Future Indicative (§ 52, 2, N; § 54, 1, b.) E. g.

"Ην οὖν μάθης μοι τοῦτον, οὖκ ἃν ἀποδοίην, if then you should (shall) learn this for me, I would not pay, &c. Arist. Nub. 116. "Ην σε ἀφέλωμαι, κάκιστ' ἀπολοίμην. Id. Ran. 586. Έγὸ δὲ ταύτην μὲν τὴν εἰρήνην, ἔως ἃν εἶς 'Αθηναίων λείπηται, οὐδέποτ' ἃν συμεδουλεύσαιμι ποιήσασθαι τῆ πόλει, I would never advise the city omke this peace, as long as a single Athenian shall be left. Dem. F. L. 345, 14. (Here ἔως λείποιτο would be the common form.) "Ωσπερ ἃν ὑμῶν ἔκαστος αἰσχυνθείη τὴν τάξιν λιπεῖν ἢν ἃν ταχθῆ ἐν τῷ πολέμω, as each one of you would be ashamed to leave the post at which he might be placed in war. Aeschin. Cor. § 7. (Here ἢν ταχθείη would be the more common expression.) Τῶν ἀτοποτάτων ἃν εἶτ, εἶ ταῦτα δυνηθεὶς μὴ πράξει Dem. Ol. I, 16, 25. Many such examples may be explained equally well by § 54, 1 (a).

Note. It will be understood that no assimilation to the Optative can take place when the protasis (after \$\epsilon\$ or a relative) consists of a present or past tense of the indicative, as in this case a change to the Optative would involve a change of time. See § 64, Rem 2.

In final and object clauses after ίνα, ὅπως, μή, &c., the Subjunctive (or Future Indicative) is generally used when the leading verb is an Optative referring to the future; the Optative, however, sometimes occurs. The preference for the Subjunctive here can be explained on the general principle (§ 31, Note 1, and § 44, 2). E. g.

(Subj.) 'Οκνοίην αν είς τὰ πλοῖα έμβαίνειν, μη καταδύση · φοβοίμην δ' αν τῷ ἡγεμόνι ἔπεσθαι, μὴ ἡμας αγάγη ὅθεν οὐχ οἶόν τε ἔσται έξελθείν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. 1, 3, 17. Οἴομαι αν υμας μέγα ὀνησαι τὸ στράτευμα, εί έπιμεληθείητε όπως αντί των απολωλότων ώς τάχιστα στρατηγοὶ καὶ λοχαγοὶ ἀντικατασταθῶσιν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙΙ, 1, 38.

(Opt.) Πειρώμην αν μή πρόσω ύμων είναι, ίνα, εί που καιρός είη, επιφανείην. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. II, 4, 17. Ἡ φυλακή γελοία τις αν φαίνοιτο, εὶ μὴ σύγε ἐπιμελοῖο ὅπως ἔξωθέν τι εἰσφέροιτο. ΧΕΝ. Occon. VII, 39. Other examples of the Optative are Aesch. Eumen. 298 (ἔλθοι, ὅπως γένοιτο); SOPH. Aj. 1221 (ὅπως προσεί-ποιμεν); SOPH. Phil. 325; Eur. Hec. 839; Xen. Cyr. I, 6, 22.

Note. In relative sentences expressing a purpose the Future Indicative is regularly retained, even after past tenses of the Indicative. For exceptional cases of the Optative in this construction, depending on the Optative with $d\nu$, see § 65, 1, Notes 1 and 3.

3. In indirect quotations and questions, depending upon an Optative which refers to the future, the Indicative is the only form regularly used to represent an Indicative of the direct discourse. But in indirect questions the Optative is sometimes found representing a dubitative Subjunctive of the direct question (§ 88). E. g.

Οὐδ' αν είς αντείποι ως οὐ συμφέρει τῆ πόλει. DEM. Megal. 202, 24. Εἰ οὖν νῦν ἀποδειχθείη τίνα χρή ἡγεῖσθαι, . . . οὐκ ἃν ὁπότε οἱ πολέμιοι ἔλθοιεν βουλεύεσθαι ἡμᾶς δέοι. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΠΙ, 2, 86.

Οὐκ αν ἔχοις ἐξελθων οι τι χρῷο σαυτῷ, if you should withdraw, you would not know what to do with yourself. Plat. Crit. 45 B. Οὐκ αν έχοις ὅ τι χρήσαιο σαυτῷ, ἀλλ' ἴλιγγιῷης αν καὶ χασμῷο οὐκ ἔχων ο τι είποις. Id. Gorg. 486 B. The direct questions here were τι χρώμαι; — τί χρήσωμαι; — τί είπως; The Subjunctive can always be retained in this construction, even after past tenses. See § 71.

Note. In Dem. Megal. 203, 12, we find a case of the Optative in an indirect quotation: Οὐ γὰρ ἐκεῖνό γ' ἃν εἴποιμεν, ὡς ἀνταλλάξασθας βουλοίμε θ' αντιπάλους Λακεδαιμονίους αντί Θηβαίων There are no other readings, and it is doubtful whether we must consider it as an exceptional case of assimilation (we could not say this, that we wished, &c.), or emend it, either by reading βουλάμεθα (as proposed by Madvig, Bemerk. p. 21), or by inserting αν, which may easily have been omitted in the Mss. before either ἀνταλλάξασθαι οτ ἀντιτάλοις. In Plat. Rep. VII, 515 D, we find in the best Mss. Τί αν οἴει αὐτὸν εἰπεῦν, εἴ τις αὐτῷ λέγοι ὅτι τότε μὲν έώρα φλυαρίας, νῦν δὲ ὀρθότερα βλέποι, what do you think he would say, if any one should tell him that all that time he had been seeing foolish phantoms, but that now he sees more correctly? Some Mss. read βλέπει.

In II. V, 85, Τυδείδην οὐκ ἃν γνοίης ποτέροισι μετείη, the Optative in the indirect question represents μέτεστιν, but οὐκ ἃν γνοίης here refers to the past, meaning you would not have known. (See § 49, 2, N. 6.)

§ 35. 1. The Present, Perfect, and the Futures in the Infinitive and Participle regularly denote time which is merely relative to that of the leading verb of the sentence. They are therefore primary when that is primary, and secondary when that is secondary. E. g.

Βούλεται λέγειν τί τοῦτό ἐστιν, he wishes to tell what this is. Έθούλετο λέγειν τί τοῦτο εἴη, he wished to tell what this was. Φησὶν ἀκηκοέναι τί ἐστιν, he says he has heard what it is. Έφη ἀκηκοέναι τί εἴη, he said he had heard what it was. Φησὶ ποιήσειν ὅτι αν βούλησθε, he says he will do whatever you shall wish. Ἔφη ποιήσειν ὅτι βούλοισθε, he said he would do whatever you should wish.

Μένουσιν βουλόμενοι είδέναι τί έστι. Εμενον βουλόμενοι είδέναι τί είη. Μένουσιν άκηκοότες τί είη. Εμενον άκηκοότες τί είη. Μένουσιν άκουσόμενοι τί είη.

Note. When the Present Infinitive and Participle represent the Imperfect (without $\tilde{a}\nu$) they are secondary without regard to the leading verb. E. g.

Πῶς γὰρ οἴεσθε δυσχερῶς ἀκούειν, εἴ τίς τι λέγοι; how unwillingly do you think they heard it, when any one said anything? See this and the other examples under \S 15, 3, and \S 73, 2.

2. When the Aorist Infinitive in itself does not refer to any definite time, it takes its time from the leading verb (like the Present), and may be either primary or secondary. But when it refers to time absolutely past, it is always a secondary tense. E. g.

Βούλεται γνώναι τί τοῦτό ἐστιν, he wishes to learn what this is. Έβούλετο γνώναι τί τοῦτο εἶη, he wished to learn what this was. (§ 23, 1.)

But φησί γνώναι τί τοῦτο είη, he says that he learned what this

- was (§ 23, 2). "Εφη γνῶναι τί τοῦτο εἴη, he sau that he had learned what this was. (Γνῶναι has the force of a primary tense in the first example, that of a secondary tense in the others.)
- 3. The Aorist Participle refers to time past relatively to the leading verb. It is therefore secondary when the leading verb is past or present and the Participle refers to time absolutely past; but it may be primary when the leading verb is future, if the Participle refers to time absolutely future. E. g.

Τοτε ήμας ελθόντας ΐνα τοῦτο ἴδοιμεν, you know that we came that we might see this. Ύπειπων τάλλα ὅτι αὐτὸς τάκεῖ πράξοι, ἄχετο. ΤΗυς. Ι, 90. Τῆ μάστιγι τυπτέσθω πληγὰς ὑπὸ κήρυκος ἐν ἀγορὰ, κηρύξαντος ὧν ἔνεκα μέλλει τύπτεσθαι. Plat. Leg. XI, 917 Ε. Ψήφων δείσας μὴ δεηθείη...τρέφει. ARIST. Vesp. 109.

4. The tenses of the Infinitive and Participle with $\tilde{a}\nu$ are followed, in dependent clauses, by those constructions that would have followed the finite moods which they represent, in the same position. See § 41, § 32, 3, and § 34.

CHAPTER III.

THE PARTICLE "AN.

- § 36. The adverb $d\nu$ (Epic $\kappa\epsilon$, Doric κd) has two uses, which must be carefully distinguished.
- 1. In one use, it denotes that the action of the verb to which it is joined is dependent upon some condition, expressed or implied. This is its force with the secondary tenses of the Indicative, and with the Optative, Infinitive, and Participle: with these it forms an apodosis, and belongs strictly to the verb.
- 2. In its other use, it is joined regularly to ϵi , if, and to all relatives and temporal particles, (and occasionally to the final particles $\dot{\omega}s$, $\ddot{\delta}\pi\omega s$ and $\ddot{\delta}\phi\rho\alpha$,) when these

words are followed by the Subjunctive. Here it seems to belong entirely to the relative or particle, with which it often coalesces, as in $\dot{\epsilon}\acute{a}\nu$, $\delta\tau a\nu$, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{a}\nu$.

REMARK 1. The rules, § 36, 1, 2, include only the constructions which are in good use in Attic Greek. For the Epic use of $\tilde{a}\nu$ with the Subjunctive in apodosis, see § 38, 2; for $\tilde{a}\nu$ with the Future Indicative, see § 37, 2.

REMARK 2. There is no word or expression in English which can be used to translate ἄν. In its first use (§ 36, 1) we express it by the mood of the verb which we use; as βούλοιτο ἄν, he would wish. In its second use, with the Subjunctive, it has no force that can be made perceptible in English. Its peculiar use can be understood only by a study of the various constructions in which it occurs. These are enumerated below, with references (when it is necessary) to the more full explanation of each in Chapter IV.

§ 37. 1. The Present and Perfect Indicative are never used with $\tilde{a}\nu$.

When this seems to occur, there is always a mixture of constructions. Thus in Plat. Leg. IV, 712 E, έγω δὲ οὖτω νὖν ἐξαίφνης ἀν ἐρωτηθεὶς ὄντως, ὅπερ εἶπον, οὐκ ἔχω εἶπεῖν, ἄν was used with a view to οὐκ ἀν εἴποιμι or some such construction, for which οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν was substituted: the meaning is, if I should suddenly be asked, I could not say, &c. So in Plat. Men. 72 C, κᾶν εἶ πολιαὶ . . . εἰσῖν, γε τι εἶδος ταὐτὸν πᾶσαι ἔχουσι, i. e. even if they are muny, sill (it would seem to follow that) they all have, &c. Examples like the last are very common in Aristotle, who seems to use κᾶν εἶ almost like καὶ εἶ, without regard to the mood of the leading verb.

REMARK. Constructions like those mentioned in § 42, 2. Note, must not be referred to this head. For οὐκ ἄν μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι is never it would not seem to me to be; but always, it does not seem to me that it would be; ἄν belonging to εἶναι.

2. The Future Indicative is often used with $\tilde{a}\nu$ or $\kappa\epsilon$ by the early poets, especially Homer. The addition of $\tilde{a}\nu$ makes the Future more contingent than that tense naturally is, giving it a force approaching that of the Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ in apodosis (§ 39). E. g.

`Αλλ' ἴθ', ἐγὰ δὲ κέ τοι Χαρίτων μίαν ὁπλοτεράων δώσω, ὀπυιέμεναι καὶ σὴν κεκλησθαι ἄκοιτιν. II. ΧΙΥ, 267. Καί κέ τις ὧδ' ἐρέει Τρώων ὑπερηνορεόντων, perhaps some one will thus speak. II. IV, 176. Ο δέ κεν κεχολώσεται, ὅν κεν ἵκωμαι, and he will perhaps be angry to whom I come. II. I, 139. Εἰ δ' ἄγε, τοὺς ἃν ἐγὰν ἐπιόψομαι οἱ δὲ πιθέσθων. II ΙΧ, 167. Παρ' ἔμοιγε καὶ ἄλλοι, οἵ κέ με τιμή-

σουσι, i. e. who will honor me when occasion offers. II. I, 174. Ε. δ' 'Οδυσεὐς ἔλθοι καὶ ἵκοιτ' ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν, αἶψά κε σὑν ῷ παιδὶ βίας ἀποτίσεται ἀνδρῶν. Od. XVII, 539. (In this passage the Future with κέ is used nearly in the sense of the Optative, corresponding to the Optatives in the Protasis. 'Αποτίσεται may also be Aorist Subjunctive, by § 38, 2.) Μαθὼν δέ τις ἃν ἐρεῖ. PIND. Nem. VII, 68. Κὰν ἔτ' ἔτι φόνιον ὄψομαι αἷμα. EUR. Elect. 484. (So the Mss.)

Note 1. The use of $\tilde{a}\nu$ with the Future Indicative in Attic Greek is absolutely denied by many critics, and the number of the examples cited in support of it have been greatly diminished by the more careful revision of the texts of the Attic writers. Still several passages remain, even in the best prose, where we must either emend the text against the authority of the Mss., or admit the construction as a rare exception to the general rule. E. g.

Αλγυπτίους δὲ οὐχ ὁρῶ ποία δυνάμει συμμάχω χρησάμενοι μᾶλλου ἄν κολ άσεσθε τῆς νῦν σὺν ἐμοὶ οὕσης. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙ, 5, 13. ᾿Απισχυρισάμενοι δὲ σαφὲς ἄν [καταστήσετε] αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴσου ὑμῦν μᾶλλον προσφέρεσθαι. ΤΗ UC. Ι, 140. (Here most editors read καταστήσαιτε, on the authority of inferior Mss.) "Εφη οὖν τὸν ἐρωτώμενον εἰπεῖν, οὐχ ῆκει, φάναι, οὐδ' ἄν ῆξει δεῦρο, nor will he be likely to come hither. Plat. Rep. X, 615 D. (Here the only other reading is ῆξοι, which is of course corrupt.) "Εφη λέγων πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὡς, εὶ διαφευξοίμην, ῆδη ἄν ὑμῶν οἱ υἰεῖς . . . πάντες παντάπασι διαφθαρήσονται. Id. Αρολ. 29 C.

The construction is perhaps less suspicious in the dramatic chorus, which belongs to lyric poetry. See the last example under § 37, 2. See § 41, 4, on the Future Infinitive and Participle with $\tilde{a}\nu$.

- Note 2. The form $\kappa \epsilon$ is much more common with the Future in Homer than the form $\tilde{a}\nu$.
- 3. The most common use of $a\nu$ with the Indicative is with the secondary tenses, generally the Imperfect and Aorist, in apodosis. It here denotes that the condition upon which the action of the verb depends is not or was not fulfilled. See § 49, 2.
- Note. The Imperfect and Aorist are sometimes used with $\tilde{a}\nu$ in an iterative sense; which construction must not be confounded with that just mentioned. See § 30, 2.
- § 38. 1. In Attic Greek the Subjunctive is used with $\tilde{a}\nu$ only in the cases mentioned in § 36, 2; never in independent sentences. See § 47, 2, § 50 1, § 51,

- and § 60, 3. For the occasional use of $d\nu$ in final clauses, see § 44, 1, Note 2.
- 2. In Epic poetry, when the Subjunctive is used nearly in the sense of the Future Indicative (§ 87), it sometimes takes $\kappa \acute{e}$ or $\mathring{a}\nu$. The combination forms an apodosis, with a protasis expressed or understood, and is nearly or quite equivalent to the Future Indicative with $\mathring{a}\nu$. E. g.

Eì δέ κε μὴ δώωσιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι, and if they do not give her up, I will take her myself. II. I, 137. (Cf. II. I, 324.)
See § 50, 1, Note 2 (a).

Note. This Epic use of $\kappa \acute{e}$ or $\vec{a}\nu$ with the Subjunctive must not be confounded with the ordinary construction of § 38, 1. In the latter the $\vec{a}\nu$ is closely connected with the particle or relative, while in the former it is joined with the verb, as it is with the Indicative or Optative. It in fact bears more resemblance to the ordinary Optative with $\vec{a}\nu$ in apodosis in Attic Greek, than to any other Attic construction.

\$39. The Optative with av always forms an apodosis, to which a protasis must be either expressed or implied. It denotes what would happen, if the condition (expressed or implied) upon which the action of the verb depends should ever be fulfilled. See § 50, 2, and § 52, 2.

REMARK. Such constructions as are explained in § 44, 1, N. 3, a, and § 74, 1, N. 2, are no exception to this rule, as there $a\nu$ does not belong to the verb.

Note. The Future Optative is not used with av. See § 26.

§ 40. The Imperative is never used with av.

Note. All passages formerly cited for $\tilde{a}\nu$ with the Imperative are now emended on Mss. authority, or otherwise satisfactorily explained. See Passow, or Liddell and Scott, s. v. "A ν .

§ 41. The Infinitive and Participle can be used with $\tilde{a}\nu$ in all cases in which a finite verb, if it stood in their place, would be accompanied with $\tilde{a}\nu$. This com

bination always forms an apodosis (except in its iterative sense, Note 3): it can never form a protasis, as the finite verb never has $\tilde{a}\nu$ joined to itself in protasis. (See § 36, 2.)

Each tense of the Infinitive and Participle with aver forms the same kind of apodosis which the corresponding tense of the Indicative or Optative would form in its place. The context must decide whether the Indicative or the Optative is represented in each case.

1. The Present Infinitive and Participle (which represent also the Imperfect, by § 15, 3, and § 16, 2), when they are used with $\tilde{a}\nu$, may be equivalent either to the Imperfect Indicative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ or to the Present Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$. They can represent no other form, as no other form of the Present is used with $\tilde{a}\nu$ in apodosis in the finite moods. E. g.

Φησὶν αὐτοὺς ἐλευθέρους ἃν εἶναι, εἶ τοῦτο ἔπραξαν, he says that they would (now) be free, if they had done this (εἶναι ἄν representing ἤσαν ἄν, § 37, 3). Φησὶν αὐτοὺς ἐλευθέρους ἄν εἶναι, εἶ τοῦτο πράξειαν, he says that they would (hereafter) be free, if they should do this (εἶναι ἄν representing εἴησαν ἄν, § 39). Οἶεσθε γὰρ τὸν πατέρα οὐκ ᾶν φυλ άττειν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν λαμβάνειν τῶν ξύλων; do you think he would not have taken care and have received the pay? Dem. Timoth. 1194, 20. (Here the direct discourse would be ἐφύλαττεν ᾶν καὶ ἐλάμβανεν.) Οἶμαι γὰρ ᾶν οὐκ ἀχαρίστως μοι ἔχειν, for I think it would not be a thankless labor; i. e. οὐκ αν ἔχοι. ΜΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙ, 3, 18. Μαρτυρίω ἐχρῶντο, μὴ ᾶν ξυ στρατεύειν, εἶν ἡ τ ἢδίκουν οἷς ἐπῆσσαν, that they would not join in expeditions, unless those against whom they were marching had wronged them. Thuc. III, 11. (Here ξυστρατεύειν ἄν represents ξυνεστράτευον ἄν.)

Οίδα αὐτοὺς ελευθέρους ἃν ὅντας, εἰ τοῦτο ἔπραξαν, I know they would (now) be free, if they had done this. Οίδα αὐτοὺς ελευθέρους ἃν ὅντας, εἰ τοῦτο πράξειαν, I know they would (hereafter) be free, if they should do this. (In the former ὅντας ἄν τερτεsents ἦσαν ἄν.) Τῶν λαμβανόντων δίκην ὅντες ἃν δικαίως (i. e. ἦμεν ἄν), whereas we should justly be among those who inflict punishment. Dem. Eubul. 1300, 8. "Οπερ ἔσχε μἢ τὴν Πελοπόννησον πορθεῖν, ἀδυνάτων ἃν ὅντων (ὑμῶν) ἐπιβοηθεῖν, when you would have been unable to bring aid (sc. if he had done it). Thuc. I. 3. Πόλλ ἃν ἔχων ἔτερ εἰπεῖν περὶ αὐτῆς παραλείπω, although I might be able (if I should wish) to say many other things about it, I omit them. Dem. Cor. 313, 4 'Απὸ παντὸς ἃν φέρων λόγου δικαίου μηχάνημα ποικίλον (i. e δς ἃν φέροις), thou who wouldst derive, &c Soph. O. C. 761.

2. The Perfect Infinitive and Participle (which represent also the Pluperfect, by § 18, 3, Rem.), when they are used with \tilde{a}_{ν} , may be equivalent either to the Pluperfect Indicative with \tilde{a}_{ν} or to the Perfect Optative with \tilde{a}_{ν} . E. g.

Εὶ μὴ τὰς ἀρετὰς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐκείνας οἱ Μαραθῶνι καὶ Σαλαμῖνι παρέσχοντο, . . . πάντα ταῦθ ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων ἃν ἑαλωκέναι (sc. φήσειεν ἄν τις), if those at Marathon and Salamis had not exhibited those deeds of valor in their behalf, any one would say that all these would have been captured by the barbarians. Dem. F. L. 441, 21. Here ἐαλωκέναι ἄν τepresents ἑαλώκεσαν ἄν, Plup. Ind.) ᾿Αλλ οὐκ ἃν ἡγοῦμαι αὐτοὺς δίκην ἀξίαν δεδωκέναι, εἰ ἀκροασάμενοι αὐτῶν καταψηφίσαισθε, but I do not believe they would (then) have suffered sufficient punishment, if you after hearing them should condemn them. Lys. XXVII, § 9. (Here the protasis in the Optative shows that δεδωκέναι ἄν represents δεδωκότες ᾶν εἶεν (§ 18, 1); but if the protasis had been εἰ κατεψηφίσασθε, if you had condemned them, δεδωκέναι ἄν would have represented ἐδεδώκεσαν ἄν, they would have suffered.) See also, in § 8 of the same oration, οὐκ ᾶν ἀπολωλέναι . . . ἀλλὰ δεδωκέναι. ᾿Ανδραποδώδεις ἃν δικαίως κεκλῆσθαι ἄν represents κεκλησμένοι ἃν εἶεν.)

These constructions are of course rare, as the forms of the finite moods here represented themselves seldom occur.

3. The Aorist Infinitive and Participle with $\tilde{a}\nu$ may be equivalent either to the Aorist Indicative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ or to the Aorist Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$. E. g.

Οὐκ ἂν ἡγεῖσθ' αὐτὸν κᾶν ἐπιδραμεῖν; do you not believe that (if this had been so) he would even have run thither? i. e. οὐκ ᾶν ἐπέδραμεν; DEM. Aph. I, 831, 10. "Ανευ δὲ σεισμοῦ οὐκ ἄν μοι δοκεῖ τὸ τοιοῦτο ξυμβῆναι γενέσθαι (οὐκ ᾶν ξυμβῆναι representing οὐκ ᾶν ξυνέβη), but unless there had been an earthquake, it does not seem to me that such a thing could have by any chance happened. Thuc. II, 89. Τοὺς ᾿Αθηναίους ἥλπιζεν ἴσως ᾶν ἐπεξελθοίεν καὶ τὴν γῆν οὐκ ᾶν περιιδεῖν τμηθῆναι (i. e. ἴσως ᾶν ἐπεξέλθοιεν καὶ οὐκ ᾶν περιίδοιεν). Id. II, 20. Οὐδ' ᾶν κρατῆσαι αὐτοὺς τῆς γῆς ἡγοῦμαι (i. e. κρατήσειαν ἄν). Id. VI, 37.

' Αλλὰ ἡαδίως ἃν ἀφεθεὶς, εἰ καὶ μετρίως τι τούτων ἐποίησε, προείλετο ἀποθανεῖν, whereas he might easily have been acquitted, &c. ΧΕΝς Μεπ. IV, 4, 4. Καὶ εἰ ἀπήχθησθε ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς, εὖ ἴσμεν μὴ ἃν ἡσσον ὑμᾶς λυπηροὺς γενομένους τοῖς ξυμμάχοις, καὶ ἀναγκασθέντας ἃν ἡ ἄρχειν, κ.τ.λ. (i. e. οὐκ ᾶν ἐγένεσθε, καὶ ἠναγκάσθητε ἄν), if you had become odious as we have, we are sure that you would have been no less oppressive to your allies, and that you would have been forced, &c. Thuc. I, 76. 'Ορῶν τὸ παρατείχομα ἀπλοῦν ὂν, καὶ ἐπικρατήσειε τις . . . ραδίως ἃν αὐτὸ ληφθείη), seeing that ѝ would easily be taken, &c. Id. VII, 42

Οὖτε ὄντα οὖτε ἃν γενόμενα λογοποιοῦσιν, they relate things which are not real, and which never could happen (i. e. οὐκ ἃν γένοιτο). .Id. VI, 38.

4. The Future Infinitive and Participle with \tilde{a}_{ν} would be equivalent to the Homeric construction of \tilde{a}_{ν} with the Future Indicative (§ 37, 2). As, however, \tilde{a}_{ν} is not found in Homer with either the Future Infinitive or the Future Participle (see below, Note 2), this construction rests chiefly on the authority of passages in Attic writers, and is subject to the same doubt and suspicion as that of the Future Indicative with \tilde{a}_{ν} in those writers. (See § 37, 2, Note 1.) In the following passages it is still retained in the best editions, with strong support from Mss.

Νομίζοντες, εὶ ταύτην πρώτην λάβοιεν, ῥαδίως ἃν σφίσι τἄλλα προσχωρήσειν. ΤΗΥC. Η, 80. (Here the direct discourse would regularly have beer either in the Fut. Ind. without ἄν, or in the Aor. Opt. with ἄν.) The same may be said of THUC. V, 82, νομίζων μέγιστον ἃν σφᾶς ἀφελήσειν. (Here one Ms. reads by correction ἀφελήσαι.) See also THUC. VI, 66; VIII, 25 and 71. Σχολῆ ποθ΄ ἢξειν δεῦρ᾽ ᾶν ἐξηύχουν ἐγώ, I declared that I should be very slow to come hither again. SOPH. Ant. 390. ᾿Αφίετε ἢ μὴ ἀφίετε, ὡς ἐμοῦ οὐκ ᾶν ποιήσοντος ᾶλλα, οὐδ᾽ εἰ μέλλω πολλάκις τεθνάναι. Plat. Αροί. 30 C. Τοὺς ότιοῦν ᾶν ἐκείνω ποιήσοντας ἀνηρηκότες ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἔσεσθε. DEM. F. L. 450, 27. (Here Cod. A. reads ποιήσαντας.)

- NOTE 1. As the Future Optative is never used with $\tilde{a}\nu$ (§ 39, Note), this can never be represented by the Future Infinitive or Participle with $\tilde{a}\nu$.
- Note 2. The Participle with \hbar or $\kappa \epsilon$ is not found in Homer or Pindar. The Infinitive with $\delta \nu$ occurs in these poets very seldom, and only in indirect discourse. E. g.

Kal δ' $\mathring{a}\nu$ τοις $\mathring{a}\lambda\lambda$ οισιν $\mathring{\epsilon}\phi\eta$ παραμνθήσασθαι. II. IX, 684. (The direct discourse is given in the words of Achilles in vs. 417, καὶ δ' $\mathring{a}\nu$ παραμυθησαίμην.)

NOTE 3. The Infinitive with $\tilde{a}\nu$ sometimes represents an *iterative* Imperfect or Aorist Indicative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ (§ 30, 2). This must be carefully distinguished from an apodosis. E. g.

' Ακούω Λακεδαιμονίους τότε έμβαλόντας ἃν καὶ κακώσαντας την χώραν ἀναχωρεῖν ἐπ' οἴκου πάλιν, I hear that the Lacedaemonians at that time, after invading and ravaging the country, used to return home again. Dem. Phil. III, 123, 16. (Here ἀναχωρεῖν ἄν represents ἀνεχώρουν ἄν in its iterative sense, they used to return.)

NOTE 4. The Infinitive with $a\nu$ commonly stands in indirect discourse after a verb of saying or thinking, as in most of the examples given above. Occasionally, however, it is found in other constructions, where the simple Present or Aorist Infinitive is regularly used. E. g.

Τὰ δὲ ἐντὸς οὕτως ἐκαἰετο, ὧστε ἥδιστα ἃν ἐς ὕδωρ ψυχρὸν σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ῥίπτειν, so that they would most gladly have thrown themselves into cold water. Τη τς. ΙΙ, 49. (Ἦστε ῥίπτειν would be the ordinary expression here: with ἄν it represents an Imperfect Indicative, ἔρριπτον ἄν.) Ἐκείνους ἀπεστερηκέναι, εἰ καὶ κρατοῖεν, μὴ ἃν ἔτι σφᾶς ἀποτειχίσαι, to have deprived them of the power of ever again walling them in, even if they should be victorious. Id. VII, 6. See § 27, N. 2 (a), for an example of βούλομαι and the Infinitive with ἄν. We have given examples of verbs of hoping, &c. with the Present, Aorist, and Future Infinitive; they sometimes take the Infinitive with ἄν, as a slight change from the Future; as in Thuc. VII, 61: τὸ τῆς τύχης κᾶν μεθ ἡμῶν ἐλπίσαντες στῆναι. (See § 27, N. 3.) Επίζω is found also with ὡς and the Future Optative in Thuc. VI, 30; and with ὡς and the Aorist Optative with ἄν in V, 9.

- Note 5. The Participle with $\tilde{a}\nu$ can never represent a protasis, because there is no form of protasis in the finite moods in which $\tilde{a}\nu$ is joined with the verb itself. For examples of apparent violations of this principle, incorrectly explained by Matthiae and others as cases of the Participle with $\tilde{a}\nu$ in protasis, see § 42, 3, Note 1.
- § 42. 1. When $\tilde{a}\nu$ is used with the Subjunctive, if it does not coalesce with the relative or particle into one word (as in $\tilde{\epsilon}a\nu$, $\tilde{\sigma}\tau a\nu$), it is separated from it only by such words as $\mu \hat{\epsilon}\nu$, $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$, $\tau \hat{\epsilon}$, $\gamma \hat{a}\rho$, &c. See examples under § 62.
- 2. When \vec{a}_{ν} stands in apodosis with any verbal form, it may be either placed near the verb, or attached to some more emphatic word in the sentence.

Particularly, it is very often placed directly after interrogatives, negatives, adverbs of time, place, &c., and other words which especially affect the sense of the sentence. E. g.

'Αλλὰ τίς δὴ θεῶν θεραπεία εἴη ἃν ἡ ὁσιότης; Plat. Euthyph. 13 D. 'Αλλ' ὁμῶς τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτῶν ῥαδίως ἃν εἴποις. Id. 14 A. Οὐκ ἃν δὴ τόνδ' ἄνδρα μάχης ἐρύσαιο μετελθῶν, Τυδείδην, δς νῶν γε ἄν καὶ Διῖ πατρὶ μάχοιτο. Π. V, 456. Πῶς ἃν τὸν αἰμυλώτατον, ἐχθρὸν ἄλημα, τούς τε δισσάρχας δλέσσας βασιλῆς, τέλος θάνοιμι καὐτός. Soph. Aj. 389. Τάχιστ' ἄν τε πόλιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἐτέρους πείσαντες ἀπολέσειαν. Thuc. Π, 63.

Note. For the sake of emphasis, ἄν is often separated from its verb by such words as οἴομαι, δοκέω, φημί, οἶδα, &c. In

such cases care must be taken to connect the $\tilde{a}\nu$ with the verb to which it really belongs. E. g.

Καὶ νῦν ἡδέως ἄν μοι δοκῶ κοινωνῆσαι, and now I think I should gladly take part (ἄν belonging to κοινωνῆσαι). Xen. Cyr. VIII, 7, 25. Οὐδ' ἀν ὑμεῖς οἶδ' ὅτι ἐπαύσασθε πολεμοῦντες, nor would you (I am sure) have ceased fighting. Dem. Phil. II, 72, 25. Τί οὖν ἄν, ἔφην, εἴη ὁ Ἔρως; Plat. Symp. 202 D. This is especially irregular in the expression οὐκ οἶδα ἄν εἰ, or οὐκ ᾶν οἶδα εἰ, followed by an Optative to which the ἄν belongs; as οὐκ οἶδ ἀν εἰ πείσαιμι, I do not know whether I could persuade him (sc. if I should try). Eur. Med. 941. The more regular form would be οὐκ οἶδα εἰ πείσαιμι ἄν. See Elmsley ad loc. (vs. 911).

3. $^{\prime}A\nu$ is sometimes used twice, or even three times, with the same verb. This may be done in a long sentence, to make the conditional force felt through the whole, especially when the connection is broken by intermediate clauses. It may also be done in order to emphasize particular words with which it is joined, and to make them prominent as being affected by the contingency. E. g.

"Ωστ' ἃν, εὶ σθένος λάβοιμι, δηλώσαιμ' ἃν οἷ' αὐτοῖς φρονῶ. Soph. El. 333. Οὐκ ἃν ἡγεῖσθ' αὐτὸν κᾶν ἐπιδραμεῖν. Dem. Aph. I, 831, 10. Οὕτ' ἃν ἐλόντες αὐθις ἀνθαλοῖεν ἄν. ΑΕΚΟΗ. Ag. 340. "Αλλους γ' ᾶν οἰοιμεθα τὰ ἡμέτερα λαβόντας δεῖξαι ἃν μάλιστα εἴ τι μετριάζομεν. Thuc. I, 76. (See § 42, 2, N.) Οὕτ' ᾶν κελεύσαιμ', οὕτ' ᾶν, εὶ θέλοις ἔτι πράσσειν, ἐμοῦ γ' ᾶν ἡδέως δρφης μέτα. Soph. Ant. 69. Λέγω καθ' ἔκαστον δοκεῖν ᾶν μοι τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα παρ' ἡμῶν ἐπὶ πλεῖστ' ᾶν εἰδη καὶ μετὰ χαρίτων μάλιστ' ᾶν εὐτραπέλως τὸ σῶμα αἴταρκες παρέχεσθαι. Τhuc. II, 41. (Here ἄν is used three times, belonging to παρέχεσθαι.) 'Υμῶν δὲ ἔρημος ἄν ἀν ἐκονὸς οἰμαι εἶναι οὕτ' ᾶν φίλον ἀφελῆσαι οὕτ' ᾶν ἐχθρὸν ἀλέξασθαι. ΧεΝ. An. I, 3, 6. (Here ἄν is used three times, belonging to εἶναι.)

Note 1. This principle, taken in connection with that stated in § 42, 2, by showing that $\tilde{a}\nu$ can be joined to any word in the sentence which it is important to emphasize, as well as to its own verb, and even to both, explains many cases in which $\tilde{a}\nu$ and a Participle appear to form a protasis (See § 41, Note 5.) If a Participle takes the place of a protasis, it is of course one of the most important words in the sentence, and one to which the particle $\tilde{a}\nu$ is especially likely to be attached. The $\tilde{a}\nu$, however, does not qualify such a Participle, any more than it does a negative or in-

terrogative with which it is connected for the same purpose; but it always belongs to the principal verb of the apodosis. E. g.

Nομίσατε τό τε φαῦλον καὶ τὸ μέσον καὶ τὸ πάνυ ἀκριβὲς ἃν ξυγκραθέν μάλιστ' ἃν ἰσχύειν, believe that these, if they should be unied, would be especially strong. Thuc. VI, 18. (Here ξυγκραθέν alone (not with ἄν) is equivalent to εἰ ξυγκραθείη (§ 52, 1), and the ἄν is placed before it merely to emphasize it, as containing the protasis to the verb ἰσχύειν, to which this ἄν, as well as the other, belongs.) 'Αγῶνας ἄν τίς μοι δοκεῖ, ἔφη, ὧ πάτερ, προειπὼν ἐκάστοις καὶ ἄθλα προτιθεὶς μάλιστ' ἃν ποιείν εὐ ἀσκεῖσθαι, it seems to me, said he, father, that if any one should proclaim contests, &c., he would cause, &c. Xen. Cyr. I, 6, 18. (Here the protasis implied in the Participles is merely emphasized by ἄν, which belongs to ποιεῖν.) Λέγοντος ἄν τινος πιστεῦσαι οἴεσθε; (i. e. εἴ τίς ἔλεγεν, ἐπίστευσαν ἄν;) do you think they would have believed it, if any one had told them? Dem. Phil. II, 71, 4. (Here too the ἄν stands near λέγοντος only to point it out as the protasis, to which its own verb πιστεῦσαι is the apodosis.)

In these cases, the protasis expressed by the Participle is affected by the $\tilde{a}\nu$, only as the ordinary protasis with ϵi is affected in the example from SOPH. El. 333, quoted above, under § 42, 3.

Note 2. $^{\prime\prime}A_{\nu}$ is sometimes used elliptically without a verb, when one can be supplied from the context. E. g.

Οἱ οἰκέται ῥέγκουσιν ἀλλ' οὐκ αν πρὸ τοῦ (sc. ἔρρεγκον), the slaves are snoring; but they would n't have done so once. Arist. Nub. 5. 'Ως οὖτ' αν ἀστῶν τῶνδ ἀν ἐξείποιμί τω, οὖτ' ἀν τέκνοισι τοῖς ἐμοῖς, στέργων ὅμως. Soph. O. C. 1528. So πῶς γὰρ ἄν (sc. εἰη); how could it? πῶς οὖκ ἄν; and similar phrases; especially ὅσπερ αν εί (also written as one word, ὡσπερανεί), in which the ἄν belongs to the verb that is understood after εἰ; as φοβούμενος ὅσπερ ἀν εἰ παῖς, fearing like a child (i. e. φοβούμενος ὥσπερ ἀν ἐφοβήθη εἰ παῖς ἢν). Plat. Gorg. 479 A. (See § 53, N. 3.)

In like manner ἄν may be used with εὶ in protasis, or with a conditional relative, the verb being understood; as in XEN. An. I, 3, 6: ὡς ἐμοῦ οὖν ἰόντος ὅπη ἄν καὶ ὑμεῖς, οὕτω τὴν γνώμην ἔχετε.

(That is, όπη αν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἴητε.)

Note 3. Repetition of $\kappa \epsilon$ is rare; yet it sometimes occurs. E. g.

Τῷ κε μάλ' ἢ κεν ἔμεινε καὶ ἐσσύμενός περ όδοῖο,
Τὰ κε με τεθνηυῖαν ἔνι μεγάροισιν ἔλειπεν. Οd. IV, 733.

On the other hand, Homer sometimes joins $\tilde{a}\nu$ and $\kappa \epsilon$ in the same sentence for emphasis. E. g.

Καρτεραὶ, από ούτ' αν κεν "Αρης δνόσαιτο μετελθών, Ούτε κ' 'Αθηναίη λαοσσόος. Η. ΧΙΙΙ, 127.

4. When an apodosis consists of several co-ordinate clauses

with the same mood, \tilde{a}_{ν} is generally used only in the first, and understood in the others; unless it is repeated for emphasis, or for some other special reason. E. g.

Οὐδ' ἃν ἐμὲ, ἡνίκα δεῦρο ἀποπλεῖν ἐβουλόμην, κατεκώλυεν, οὐδὲ τοιαῦτα λέγειν τούτω προσέταττεν, έξ ων ήκισθ ύμεις εμέλλετ εξιέναι. Dem. F. L. 357, 3. (Here αν is understood with προσέταττεν.) Οὔτω δὲ δρῶν οὐδὲν αν διάφορον τοῦ ἐτέρου ποιοῖ. ἀλλ' έπὶ ταὐτὸν ἀμφότεροι ἴοιεν. PLAT. Rep. II, 360 C. Οὐκοῦν καν, εἰ πρὸς αὐτὸ τὸ φῶς ἀναγκάζοι αὐτὸν βλέπειν, ἀλγεῖν τε αν τὰ ὅμματα καὶ Φεύγειν ἀποστρεφόμενον (οίει); Id. VII, 515 E. (This example illustrates also the principle of § 42, 3, καν belonging to the Infinitives.) See also XEN. An. Π, 5, 14. Πάντα ήρει ὁ Φίλιππος, πολλά λέγοντος έμου καὶ θρυλούντος ἀεὶ, τὸ μὲν πρώτον ὡς αν εἰς κοινὸν γνώμην αποφαινομένου, μετά ταθτα δ' ώς άγνοοθντας διδάσκοντος, τελευτῶντος δὲ ὡς ἃν πρὸς πεπρακότας αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀνοσιωτάτους ἀνθρώπους ούδεν ύποστελλομένου. DEM. F. L. 390, 5. (The first αν belongs to άπεφαινόμην implied, as I should have declared it, if I had been speaking to inform my colleagues; in the following clause the same tense (¿ðiðaσκον) is implied, and äν is not repeated; in the third clause, on the contrary, an Optative is implied, ώς αν λέγοιμι, and therefore the av again appears.) In PLAT. Rep. III, 398 A, we find av used with two co-ordinate Optatives, understood with a third, and repeated again with a fourth to avoid confusion with a dependent "Av may be understood with an Optative even in a separate sentence, if the construction is continued from a sentence in which au is used with the Optative; as in Plat. Rep. I, 352 Ε:- "Εσθ' ότω αν άλλω ίδοις η όφθαλμοῖς; Οὐ δῆτα. Τί δέ; ἀκούσαις άλλω η ἀσίν; So with πράττοι, Id. IV, 439 Β.

CHAPTER IV.

USE OF THE MOODS.

This chapter includes all those constructions which require any other form of the finite verb than the simple Indicative expressing an absolute assertion (§ 2). The Infinitive and Participle are included here only so far as they are used in indirect discourse, or in Protasis and Apodosis.

These constructions are divided into the following classes:—

- Final and Object Clauses after "να, ως, ὅπως, ὅφρα, and μή.
- II. Conditional Sentences.
- III. Relative and Temporal Sentences.
- IV. Indirect Discourse, including Indirect Quotations and Questions.
- V. Causal Sentences.
- VI. Expressions of a Wish.
- VII. Imperative and Subjunctive in Commands, Exhortations, and Prohibitions.
- VIII. Subjunctive (like the Future Indicative) in Independent Sentences. Interrogative Subjunctive. $O\dot{v}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ with the Subjunctive or Future Indicative.

SECTION I.

Final and Object Clauses after Iva, Os, Op ω s, Op ρa , and M $\dot{\eta}$.

§ 43. The clauses which depend upon the so called final particles, ίνα, ώς, ὅπως, ὅφοα, that, in

order that, and $\mu\eta$, lest, that not, may be divided into three classes:—

- A. Pure final clauses, in which the end, purpose, or motive of the action of any verb may be expressed, after any one of the final particles; as $\tilde{\epsilon} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota \tilde{\nu} a \tau c \hat{\nu} \tau o \tilde{\nu} t \delta \eta$, he is coming that he may see this; $\hat{a} \pi \epsilon \rho \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota \mu \eta \tau c \hat{\nu} \tau o \tilde{\nu} t \delta \eta$, he is departing that he may not see this.
- B. Object clauses with ὅπως or ὅπως μή after verbs of striving, &c.; as σκόπει ὅπως γενήσεται, see that it happens; σκόπει ὅπως μὴ γενήσεται, see that it does not happen. These clauses express the direct object of the verb of striving, &c., so that they may stand in apposition to an object accusative like τοῦτο; as σκόπει τοῦτο ὅπως μή σε ὄψεται, see to this, viz., that he does not see you. They also imply the end or purpose of the action of the leading verb, and to this extent they partake of the nature of final clauses.
- C. Object clauses with μή after verbs of fearing, &c.; as φοβοῦμαι μὴ γένηται, I fear lest it may happen; φοβοῦμαι μὴ τοῦτο ἐγένετο, I fear lest this happened. These express simply the object of fear, without even implying any purpose to prevent that object from being realized. Thus if we say φοβοῦμαι τοῦτο, μὴ κακῶς πράξω, I fear this, lest I may fall into misfortune, the clause with μή merely explains τοῦτο, the direct object of φοβοῦμαι.

REMARK. Although the object clauses of the class B partake slightly of the nature of final clauses, so that they sometimes allow the same construction (the Subjunctive for the Future Indicative, § 45), still the distinction between these two classes is very strongly marked. An object clause, as we have seen, can stand in apposition to a preceding τοῦτο; whereas a final clause could stand in apposition to τούτου

ενεκα, as ερχεται τούτου ενεκα, ίνα ήμεν βοηθήση, he comes for this purpose, viz., that he may assist us. The two can be combined in one sentence; as σπουδάζει ὅπως πλουτήσει, ΐνα τοὺς φίλους εν ποιῆ, he is eager to be rich, that he may benefit his friends.

Care must be taken not to mistake the nature of an object clause, when its subject is attracted by the leading verb; as σκοπεῖν τὴν πόλιν ὅπως σωθήσεται for σκοπεῖν ὅπως ἡ πόλις σωθήσεται, to see that the city is saved.

Note 1. "O $\phi \rho a$ is found only in Epic and Lyric poetry.

Note 2. The regular negative adverb after $i\nu a$, $\dot{\omega}s$, $\ddot{\delta}\pi\omega s$, and $\ddot{\delta}\phi\rho a$ is $\mu\dot{\eta}$; but after $\mu\dot{\eta}$, lest, où is used. E. g.

'Απέρχεται, ΐνα μὴ τοῦτο ἴδη, he is departing that he may not see this. Φοβεῖται μὴ οὐ τοῦτο γένηται, he is afraid lest this may not happen. This use of οὐ as the negative after μή seems to have no other object than to avoid repetition of μή. Where, however, the sentence is so long that this repetition would not be noticed, we find μή repeated; as in Xen. Mem. I, 2, 7: ἐθαύμαζε δ' εἴ τις φοβοῖτο μὴ ὁ γενόμενος καλὸς κάγαθὸς τῷ τὰ μέγιστα εὖεργετήσαντι μὴ τὴν μεγίστην χάριν ἔξοι.

A. Pure Final Clauses.

§ 44. 1. In pure final clauses the Subjunctive is regularly used, if the leading verb is primary; and the Optative, if the leading verb is secondary. E. g.

Νῦν δ' ἔρχεσθ' ἐπὶ δεῖπνον, ἴνα ξυνάγωμεν Ἄρηα. Π. Π, 381. Σοὶ δ' ὧδε μνηστήρες ὑποκρίνονται, ἵν' εἰδῆς αὐτὸς σῷ θυμῷ, εἰδῶσι δὲ πάντες ἀχαιοί. Οd. Π, 111. Εἴπω τι δῆτα κᾶλλ', ἵν' ὀργίζη πλέον; SOPH. O. R. 364. Καὶ γὰρ βασιλεὺς αἰρεῖται, οὐχ ἵνα ἐαυτοῦ καλῶς ἐπιμελῆται, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ οὶ ἐλόμενοι δι' αὐτὸν εὖ πράττωσι. ΧΕΝ. Μεm. Π, 2, 3. Δοκεῖ μοι κατακαῦσαι τὰς ἀμάξας, ἵνα μὴ τὰ ζεύγη ἡμῶν στρατηγῆ. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Π, 2, 27. Ἦρνοθ', ἵν' ἀθανάτοισι ψόως φέροι ἡδὲ βροτοῖσιν. Od. V, 2. Φίλος ἐβούλετο εἶναι τοῖς μέγιστα δυναμένοις, ἵνα ἀδικῶν μὴ διδοίη δίκην. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Π, 6, 21.

Βουλήν δ' 'Αργείοις ὑποθησόμεθ', ή τις ὀνήσει, ὡς μἡ πάντες ὅλωνται ἀδυσσαμένοιο τεοῖο. Π. VIII, 36. Διανοεῖται τὴν γέφυραν λῦσαι, ὡς μἡ διαβῆτε, ἀλλ' ἐν μέσφ ἀποληφθῆτε. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙ, 4, 17. Πέφνε δ' Εύρυτον, ὡς Αὐγέαν λάτριον μισθὸν πράσσοιτο. PIND. Ol. XI (X), 34. Τούτου ἔνεκα φίλων ἄετο δεῖσθαι, ὡς συνεργους ἔχοι. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Ι, 9, 21.

Τὸν δὲ μνηστῆρες λοχῶσιν, ὅπως ἀπὸ φῦλον ὅληται ἐξ Ἰθάκης. Od. XIV, 181. Μέθες τόδ' ἄγγος νῦν, ὅπως τὸ πᾶν μάθης. Soph. El. 1205. Εἰς καιρὸν ἤκεις, ὅπως τῆς δίκης ἀκούσης. ΧΕΝ. Cyr III, 1, 8. Παρακαλείς Ιατρούς, ὅπως μὴ ἀποθάνη. ΧΕΝ. Μem. II. 10, 2. Οἰμαι δὲ ταῦτα γίγνεσθαι, σὐχ ὅπως τοὺς αὐτοὺς χοροὺς κρίνωσιν οἱ πολίται, οὐδ' ὅπως τοὺς αὐτοὺς αὐτοὺς κροούς κρίνωσιν οἱ πολίται, οὐδ' ὅπως τοὺς αὐτοὺς αὐτοῦς ἤδωνται, ἀλλ' ἴνα τοῖς νόμοις πείθωνται. ΧΕΝ. Μem. IV, 4, 16. Έν χείρεσ σιν ἔθηκεν, ὅπως ἔτι πῆμα φύγοιμι. Od. XIV, 312. Ἐπρεσβεύοντο ἐγκλήματα ποιούμενοι, ὁπως σφίσιν ὅτι μεγίστη πρόφασις εἴη τοῦ πολεμεῖν. ΤΗυC. I, 126.

Κεφαλή κατανεύσομαι, όφρα πεποίθης. Π. Ι, 524. "Ορσεο δη νῦν, ξεῖνε, πόλινδ' ἴμεν ὄφρα σε πέμψω. Οd. VI, 255. Δόμον Φερσεφόνας ελθε, ὄφρ' ἰδοῖσ' νίὰν εἴπης. PIND. Ol. XIV, 30. Αὐτὰρ εμοὶ γέρας αὐτίχ' ετοιμάσατ', ὄφρα μὴ οἶος Άργείων ἀγέραστος εω. Π. Ι, 118. "Ως δ μὲν ἔνθα κατέσχετ' ἐπειγόμενός περ όδοῖο, ὄφρ'

έταρον θάπτοι καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερίσειεν. Od. III, 284.

'Αλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν αὖτις ἀπόστιχε, μή τι νο ή ση "Ηρη' ἐμοὶ δέ κε ταῦτα μελήσεται, ὅφρα τ ελ έσσω. Π. Ι, 522. Οὐ δῆτ' αὐτὸν ἄξεις δεῦρο, μή τις ἀναρπάση; Soph. Αϳ, 986. Λυσιτελεί ἐἀσαι ἐν τῷ παρόντι, μὴ καὶ τοῦτον πολέμιον προσθώμε θα. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. Η, 4, 12. Λέγεται ἐἰπεῖν ὅτι ἀπιέναι βούλοιτο, μὴ ὁ πατήρ τι ἄχθοιτο καὶ ἡ πόλις μέμφοιτο. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. Ι, 4, 25.

Note 1. The Future Indicative sometimes (though rarely) takes the place of the Subjunctive in pure final clauses, after $\delta\pi\omega s$ and $\delta\phi\rho a$ ($\delta\pi\omega s$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$, $\delta\phi\rho a$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$); — never after $\delta\pi\omega s$, and very seldom after the simple $\mu\dot{\eta}$. (M $\dot{\eta}$ with the Future is commonly found only after verbs of the next two classes; §§ 45, 46.) Here, as well as after verbs of striving and of fearing, the Future differs from the Subjunctive only by being a more vivid form of statement. E. g.

Αἰεὶ δὲ μαλακοῖσι καὶ αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισι θέλγει, ὅπως Ἰθάκης ἐπιλήσσεται. Od. I, 56. Οὐδὲ δι' ἐν ἄλλο τρέφονται ἢ ὅπως μαχοῦνται ὑπὲρ τῶν τρεφόνταν. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. II, 1, 21. Χρὴ ἀναβιβάζειν ἐπὶ τὸν τροχὸν τοὺς ἀναγραφέντας, ὅπως μὴ πρότερον νὺξ ἔσται πρὶν πυθέσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἄπαντας. ΑΝDOC de Myster. I, p. 6, 38. § 43. 'Επ' αὐτοὺς τοὺς προλόγους σου τρέψομαι, ὅπως τὸ πρῶτον τῆς τραγωδίας μέρος πρώτιστον βασανιῶ. ΑRIST. Ran. 1120. In Nub. 1466, ὅπωι ἀπολεῖς μετελθών (not μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔλθ') is to be explained by § 45, Ν. 7. Θάρσυνον δέ οἱ ἦτορ ἐνὶ φρεσὶν, ὄφρα καὶ Ἔκτωρ εἴσεται. II. XVI, 242. So Od. IV, 163. "Ωστ' εἰκὸς ἡμᾶς μὴ βραδύνειν ἐστι, μὴ καί τις ὄψεται χῆμῶν ἴσως κατείπη. ΑRIST. Eccles. 495. So μὴ κεχολώσεται, II. ΧΧ, 301. This construction is very rare in Attic prose.

Note 2. The Particle av (κέ) is sometimes joined with

 $\dot{\omega}$ s, $\ddot{\omega}$ πωs, and $\ddot{\omega}$ φρα, before the Subjunctive in final clauses; especially with $\dot{\omega}$ s and $\ddot{\omega}$ φρα in Homer. The $\ddot{\omega}$ ν here is always joined to the particle, and (as in protasis) it adds nothing to the sense which can be made perceptible in English. E. g.

Πείθεο, ὡς ἄν μοι τιμὴν μεγάλην καὶ κῦδος ἄρηαι, obey, that thou mayest gain for me great honor and glory. II. XVI, 84. (Here ὡς ἄν ἄρηαι seems to be merely a weaker form of expression than ὡς ἄρηαι would have been.) 'Αλλ' ἴθι, μή μ' ἐρέθιζε, σαώτερος ὧς κε νέηαι, that thou mayest go the more safely. II. I, 32. 'Αλλ' οὖτος μὲν νῦν σοὶ ἄμ' ἔψεται, ὄφρα κεν εῦ δη σοῖσιν ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν. Οὐ. III, 359. Προσδεόμεθα συμπέμψαι ἡμῖν, ὡς ἄν μιν ἐξέλωμεν ἐκ τῆς χώρης. Ηστ. I, 36. 'Αλλ' ἐάσωμεν, φίλοι, ἔκηλον αὐτὸν, ὡς ἄν εἰς ὅπνον πέση. Soph. Phil. 825. Τουτὶ λαβών μου τὸ σκιάδειον ὑπέρεχε ἄνωθεν, ὡς ᾶν μή μ' ὁρῶσιν οἱ θεοί. ΑΚΙΝΤ. Αν. 1508. Καί φατε αὐτὸν τοιοῦτον εἶναι, ὅπως ᾶν φαίνηται ὡς κάλλιστος καὶ ἄριστος. Plat. Symp. 199 Α. "Αν γέ τινας ὑποπτεύη ἐλεύθερα φρονήματα ἔχοντας μὴ ἐπιτρέψειν αὐτῷ ἄρχειν, (πολέμους κινεῖ) ὅπως ᾶν τούτους μετὰ προφάσεως ἀπολλύη, that he may destroy them. Plat. Rep. VIII, 567 Α. 'Ως ᾶν μάθης, ἀντάκουσον. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Π, 5, 16. See also An. VII, 4, 2; ΑΕSCH. Prom. 10 (ὡς ἄν), 824 (ὅπως ἄν), Eumen. 573 (ὅπως ἄν).

Note 3. (a.) Homer and Herodotus sometimes use $\tilde{a}\nu$ or $\kappa\epsilon$ in final clauses with the same particles before the Optative, with no apparent effect upon the verb. E. g.

Καί μιν μακρότερον καὶ πάσσονα θῆκεν ἰδέσθαι, ῶς κεν Φαικήκεσσι φίλος πάντεσσι γένοιτο. Od. VIII, 20. Ἐννῆμαρ δ' ἐς τεῖχος ἵει ἑόον ὖε δ' ἄρα Ζεὺς συνεχὲς, δ φρα κε θᾶσσον ἄλίπλοα τείχεα θε ίπ. Π. ΧΙΙ, 25. Σὶ δέ με προίεις ἐς πατέρα, ὅφρ' ἄν ἐλοίμην δῶρι. Od. ΧΧΙΥ, 334. Διώρυχα (ἄρυσσεν), ὅκως ἀν τὸ στρατόπεδον ἱδρυμένον κατὰ νώτου λάβοι. Ηρτ. Ι, 75. Ταῦτα δὲ περὶ ἐωντὸν ἐσέμνυε τῶνδε εἴνεκεν, ὅκως ἀν μὴ ὁρέοντες οἱ ὁμήλικες λυπεοίατο καὶ ἐπιβουλεύοιεν, ἀλλ' ἐτεροιός σφι δοκέοι εἶναι μὴ ὁρέωσι, in order that his campanions might not be offended by seeing him and plot against him, but that he might appear to them to be of another nature by their not seeing him. Id. I, 99.

(b.) Apart from this use, however, the Optative can be regularly joined with $a\nu$ in any final clause, if it forms an apodosis with the verb, to which there is a protasis expressed or distinctly understood. Such Optative with $a\nu$ can follow primary as well as secondary tenses. (§ 31, N. 2.) E. g.

'Hyelaθω ὀρχηθμοίο, ως κέν τις φαίη γάμον ἔμμεναι ἐκτὸς ἀκούων, let him lead off the dance, so that any one who should hear without would say there was a marriage. Od. XXIII, 134. 'Ως δ' δυ δίδιστα ταῦτα φαίνοιτο, αὐτός τις αὐτῷ ταῦτα παρασκευάσει, lit. but each one must acquire these things for himself, to cause that they would appear most agreeable (if any one should experience them). XEN Cyr.

VII, 5, 81. "Έδωκε χρήματα 'Ανταλκίδα, ὅπως αν, πληρωθέντος ναυτικοῦ ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων, οἱ 'Αθηναῖοι μᾶλλον τῆς εἰρήνης προσδέοιντο. ΧΕΝ. Hell. IV, 8, 16. (Here πληρωθέντος ναυτικοῦ, if the navy should be manned, stands as a protasis to the Optative προσδέοιντο ἄν.)

Such sentences as Dem. Phil. Π, 66, 15, ως δε κωλύσαιτ αν εκείνον πράττειν ταῦτα, παντελως ἀργως έχετε, but as to any measures by which you could prevent him from doing these things, you are wholly inactive, are not final clauses, but relative sentences with an ante-

cedent implied. See § 65, 1, N. 4.

REMARK. M $\acute{\eta}$, lest, can be followed by a verb with $\emph{a}\nu$ only in a regular apodosis after verbs of fearing, &c. (See § 46, N. 3.) "Iva is never used with $\emph{a}\nu$, except when it means where. A single case of $\emph{i}\nu a$ with $\kappa \acute{\epsilon}$ in a final clause occurs, Od. XII, 156:—'AAA' $\acute{\epsilon}\rho \acute{\epsilon}\omega$ $\mu \acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma \acute{\omega}\nu$, $\emph{i}\nu a$ $\acute{\epsilon}l\acute{\delta}\acute{\sigma}\epsilon s$ \emph{i} $\kappa \acute{\epsilon}$ $\theta \acute{a}\nu \omega \mu \acute{\epsilon}\nu$, \emph{ij} $\kappa \acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $d\grave{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{a}\mu \acute{\epsilon}\nu \iota$ $\theta \acute{a}\nu a \iota \acute{\nu}$ $\delta \acute{\nu}$

Note 4. A purpose can be expressed by a relative and the Future Indicative (\S 65, 1), or by the Future Participle (\S 109, 5). For the use of $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ to express a purpose, see \S 98, 2.

2. As all final clauses express the purpose or motive of some person, they admit of the double construction of indirect discourse (§ 77, 2); so that, instead of the Optative after secondary tenses, we can have the mood and tense which the person himself might have used when he conceived the purpose in his own mind. That is, we can say either $\hat{\eta}\lambda\theta\varepsilon\nu$ "va " $\delta\sigma$, he came that he might see (by § 44, 1); or $\hat{\eta}\lambda\theta\varepsilon\nu$ "va " $\delta\eta$, because the person himself would have said $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\chi\rho\mu a$ "va " $\delta\omega$, I come that I may see.

Hence the Subjunctive in final clauses after secondary tenses is nearly as common as the more regular Optative. E. g.

'Επεκλώσαντο δ' ὅλεθρον ἀνθρώποις, ἵνα ἢσι καὶ ἐσσομένοισιν ἀοιδή. Od. VIII, 579. Καὶ ἐπίτηδές σε οὐκ ἢγειρον, ἵνα ὡς ἢδιστα διάγης. ΡιΑτ. Crit. 43 Β. Πλοῖα κατέκαυσεν ἵνα μὴ Κῦρος διαβἢ. ΧΕΝ. ΑΝ. Ι, 4, 18. 'Αχλὺν δ' αὖ τοι ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἔλον, ἢ πρὶν ἐπῆεν, ἄφρ' εὖ γιγνώσκης ἡμὲν θεὸν ἢδὲ καὶ ἄνδρα. Π. Υ. 127. 'Αριστεὺς ξυνεβούλευεν ἐκπλεῦσαι, ὅπως ἐπὶ πλέον ὁ σῖτος ἀντίσχη. Τηυς. Ι, 65. 'Ηλθον πρεσβευσόμενοι, ὅπως μὴ σφίσι τὰ 'Αττικόν (ναυτικὸν) προσγενόμενον ἐμπόδιον γένηται. Τηυς. Ι, 31. 'Εχώρουν ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν, ὅπως μὴ κατὰ φῶς προσφέρωνται καὶ σφίσιν ἐκ τοῦ ἵσου γίγνωνται, ἀλλ'... ἤσσους ὧσι. Τηυς.

II, 3. Ταύτας ΐνα κωλύηθ' οἱ νόμοι συνήγαγον ὑμᾶς, οὐχ ΐνα κυρίας τοῖς ἀδικοῦσι ποιῆτε. Dem. F. L. 341, 12. Καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐμνήσθην, ΐνα μὴ ταὐτὰ πάθητε. Dem. Ol. III, 30, 10. (Here the pur pose was conceived in the form, ΐνα μὴ ταὐτὰ πάθωσιν.)

REMARK. This principle applies equally well to the clauses which follow ὅπως and ὅπως μή after verbs of striving (§ 45), and

μή after verbs of fearing, &c. (§ 46).

This is a favorite construction with certain authors, as Thucy-dides; who also, on the same principle, prefer the Indicative to the Optative in ordinary indirect quotations after secondary tenses. See § 70, 2, Remark 2.*

NOTE 1. This use of the Subjunctive instead of the Optative makes the language more vivid, by introducing as nearly as possible the exact words or thoughts of the person whose purpose is thus stated.

As the two forms are equally correct (the only difference being that just stated), we find them both in the same sentence, as we find the Indicative and Optative interchanged in indirect quotations. (See § 70, 2, Remark 1.) E. g.

Έξακοσίους λογάδας ἐξέκριναν, ὅπως τῶν τε Ἐπιπολῶν εἴησαν φύλακες, καὶ ἢν ἐς ἄλλο τι δέη, ταχὺ ξυνεστῶτες παραγίγνωνται, they selected them, that they might be guards of Epipolae, and that they might be on hand if they should be needed for anything else. Thuc. VI, 96. Παρανίσχον δὲ φρυκτοὺς, ὅπως ἀσαφῆ τὰ σημεία τοῖς πολεμίοις ἢ καὶ μὴ βοηθοίεν, they raised fire-signals at the same time, in order that the enemy's signals might be unintelligible to them, and that they (the enemy) might not bring aid. Thuc. III, 22.

The ordinary interpretation of the latter and similar passages, proposed by Arnold, viz. "that the Subjunctive mood indicates the immediate, and the Optative the remote consequence of the action contained in the principal verbs, the second being a consequence of

the first," manifestly cannot apply to the first example.

NOTE 2. (a.) The use of the Optative for the Subjunctive in final clauses after *primary* tenses is, on the other hand, very rare, and is to be viewed as a mere irregularity of construction. It occurs chiefly in Homer. E. g.

"Αξω τῆλ' 'Ιθάκης, ΐνα μοι βίστον πολύν ἄλφοι. Od. XVII, 250. So Ii. I, 344, ὅππως μαχέοιντο.

^{*} Madvig remarks (Bemerkungen, p. 12) that he finds in the first two books of Thucydides no example of the Optative after $\delta \pi \omega s$ or $\mu \dot{\eta}$ depending on a secondary tense of a verb of striving or fearing; although he cites fifteen examples of the Subjunctive from the same books. In pure final clauses after secondary tenses, the usage in Thucydides is nearly equally divided between the Subjunctive and the Optative. Xenophon, on the other hand, generally follows the rule, § 44, 1.

(b.) Sometimes the Optative is used because the leading verb implies a reference to the past as well as the present. E. g.

Τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τρόπον ὁ νόμος, ἵνα μηδὲ πεισθῆναι μηδὶ ἐξαπατηθῆναι γένοιτὶ ἐπὶ τῷ δήμῳ. Dem. Androt. 596, 17. (Here ἔχει implies also the past existence of the law; the idea being, the law was made as it is, so that it might not be possible, &c.)

3. The secondary tenses of the *Indicative* are used in final clauses after $i\nu a$, sometimes after $\dot{\omega}s$ or $\delta\pi\omega s$, to denote that the end or object is dependent upon some unfulfilled condition, and therefore is not or was not attained. This construction is peculiar to Attic Greek.

These tenses of the Indicative have here the same difference in meaning as in conditional sentences (§ 49, 2), the Imperfect referring to present time or to continued or repeated action in past time, the Aorist and Pluperfect to past time. Thus τνα τοῦτο ἔπραττεν means in order that he might be doing this (but he is not doing it), or that he might have been doing this (but he was not); τνα τοῦτο ἔπραξεν means that he might have done this (but he did not); τνα τοῦτο ἐπεπράχει means that he might have done this (but he has not). E. g.

Οὐκ ἃν ἐσχόμην, κ.τ.λ., ἵν' ἢ τυφλός τε καὶ κλύων μηδέν, in that case I should not have forborne (to destroy my hearing), so that I should be both blind and devoid of hearing (implying that really he is not so). Soph. O. T. 1387. Φεῦ, φεῦ, τὸ μὴ τὰ πράγματ' ἀνθρώποις ἔχειν φωνὴν, ἵν' ἦσαν μηδὲν οἱ δεινοὶ λόγοι, Alax! alas! that the facts have no voice for men, so that words of eloquence might be as nothing. Eur. Hippol. Frag. 442. Έχρην είσκαλέσαντας μάρτυρας πολλούς παρασημήνασθαι κελεύσαι τὰς διαθήκας, τν', εί τι εγίγνετο ἀμφισβητήσιμον, ήν είς τὰ γράμματα ταῦτ' ἐπανελθεῖν. Dem. Aph. II, 837, 11. (This implies that they did not have the will thus sealed, so that it is not now possible to refer to it in case of dispute.) Έχρην αὐτοὺς ζητείν, ἵνα ἀπηλλάγμεθα τούτου τοῦ δημαγωγοῦ, they ought to have made an investigation, in order that we might have been already freed from this demagogue (but we have not been freed from him). ĎΙΝΑΒΟΗ. in Demosth. p. 91, 24. Ἐζήτησεν ἄν με τὸν γτοπ πετη. ΕΙΚΑΚΟΙΙ. ΤΗ Demostre p. 01, 24. Εξητησεν τω με του παίδα, Ιν' εἰ μὴ παρεδίδουν μηδὲν δίκαιον λέγειν ἐδόκουν. DEM. Aph. III, 849, 24. Τί μ' οὐ λαβὼν ἔκτεινας εὐθὺς, ὡς ἔδειξα μήποτε ἐμαυτὸν ἀνθρώποισιν ἔνθεν ἢ γεγώς; that I might never have shown as I have done. SOPH. O. T. 1391. Εἰ γάρ μ' ὑπὸ γῆν ῆκεν, ὡς μήτε θεὸς μήτε τις ἄλλος τοῖσδ' ἐγεγήθει, would that he had sent me and the sent had sent me and sent me and sent had sent me and sent me a under the earth, so that neither any God nor any one else should have rejoiced at these things (as they have done). AESCH. Prom. 152. (If we read έπεγήθει, we must translate, might be rejoicing, as then

are.) Τί δητ'.... οὐκ ἔρριψ' ἐμαυτὴν τῆσδ' ἀπὸ πέτρας, ὅπως τῶν πάντων πόνων ἀπηλλά γην; why did I not throw myself from this rock, that I might have been freed from all my toils? Id. 747.

REMARK. This construction is especially common when a final clause depends either upon an apodosis which contains a secondary tense of the Indicative (§ 49, 2) implying the non-fulfilment of the condition, as is the case in examples 1, 3, 4, and 5, above, or upon a verb expressing an unfulfilled wish, as in examples 2 and 7. In these cases the Indicative seems to be used by a sort of assimilation.

NOTE 1. The particle $\tilde{a}v$ is very rarely joined with the secondary tenses of the Indicative in final clauses. When it is used, it denotes that the sentence is an apodosis (as well as a final clause), with a protasis expressed or understood. E. g.

Ζώντι έδει βοηθείν, ὅπως ὅτι δικαιότατος ὧν καὶ ὁσιώτατος εζη τε ζῶν καὶ τελευτήσας ἀτιμώρητος ἃν κακῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐγίγνετο, i. e. that he might be exempt from punishment after death (as he would be, if he had so lived). Plat. Leg. XII, 959 B.

NOTE 2. The Indicative can never be used in this construction, unless it is distinctly implied that the result is not (or was not) attained, that is, unless the final clause refers either to the present or to the past (as in the examples given above): if it refers to the future, it must be expressed in the ordinary way by the Subjunctive or Optative, even although it depends on one of the class of verbs mentioned above (Remark). Both constructions may occur in the same sentence. E. g.

Οθς (τῶν νέων τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς) ἡμεῖς ᾶν ἐφυλάττομεν ἐν ἀκροπόλει, Γνα μηδεὶς αὐτοὺς δι έφθειρεν, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἀφίκοιντο εἰς τὴν ἡλικίαν, χρήσιμοι γίγνοιντο ταῖς πόλεσιν, we should have kept them (in that case) in the Acropolis, that no one might corrupt them (as they are now corrupted), and that when (in the future) they should become of age they might become useful to their states. Plat. Men. 89 B. Ταῦτ αν ἤδη λέγειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπεχείρουν, Γιν εἰδῆτε, κ.τ.λ. I should (if that were so) be now undertaking to say this to you, that you might (hereafter) know, &c. Dem. Aristocr. 623, 11. See also the examples under § 32, 3 (b.).

B. Object Clauses with "Όπως and "Όπως μή after Verbs of Striving, &c.

§ 45. After verbs signifying to strive, to take care, to effect, and the like, the Future Indicative is regularly used with $\delta\pi\omega$ s and $\delta\pi\omega$ s $\mu\dot{\eta}$, if the leading verb is primary. The Subjunctive also occurs, but much less frequently than the Future.

If the leading verb is secondary, the Future Optative may be used, to correspond to the Future Indicative after primary tenses; but generally the Future Indicative is employed here also, on the principle of § 44, 2. The other tenses of the Optative are sometimes used, to correspond to the same tenses of the Subjunctive after primary tenses; or the Subjunctive itself may be employed (§ 44, 2). E. g.

Έπιμελείται ὅπως (οτ ὅπως μὴ) γενήσεται οτ γένηται, he takes care that it may (or may not) happen. Ἐπεμελείτο ὅπως γενήσεται, γενή-

σοιτο, or γένοιτο, he took care that it should happen.

(Fut.) "Ωσπερ τὸν ποιμένα δεῖ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι ὅπως σῷαί τε ἔσονται αί οίες και τὰ ἐπιτήδεια εξουσιν, οῦτω και τὸν στρατηγὸν ἐπιμελείσθαι δεί όπως σφοί τε οί στρατιώται έσονται καὶ τὰ έπιτήδεια έξουσι, καὶ, οὖ ένεκα στρατεύονται, τοῦτο έσται. ΧΕΝ. Μεm. ΗΙ, 2, 1. Καλόν τὸ παρασκευάζειν ὅπως ὡς βέλτισται ἔσονται τῶν πολιτών αι ψυχαί. PLAT. Gorg. 503 A. Μίκραν πρόνοιαν έχειν δοκεί όπως ό νόμος κύριος έσται και μήτε συγχυθήσεται μήτ αὐ μετα-ποιηθήσεται; Dem. Aristocr. 640, 10. Καλώς δὲ δημαγωγήσεις, ήν σκοπής όπως οἱ βέλτιστοι μὲν τὰς τιμὰς ἔξουσιν, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι μηδὲν ἀδικήσονται. Isoc. Nicocl. p. 18 A. § 16. "Όρα ὅκως μὴ ἀποστήσονται. ΗDT. III, 36. Σοὶ μελέτω ὅκως μή σε ὄψεται. Η ΕΤ. Ι, 9. Φρόντιζ' ὅπως μηδὲν ἀνάξιον τῆς τιμῆς ταύτης πράξεις. Isoc. Nicocl. p. 22 B. § 37. Τί μάλιστ' έν απασι διεσπούδασται τοις νόμοις; ὅπως μὴ γενήσονται οἱ περὶ ἀλλήλους φόνοι. Dem. Lept. 505, 9. Δει εὐλαβείσθαι, μάλιστα μὲν ὅπως μὴ ἐγγενήσεσθον, ἄν δὲ ἐγγένησθον, ὅπως ὅτι τάχιστα ἐκτετμήσεσθον. Plat. Rep. VIII, 564 C. (For the force of the Future Perfect, see § 29, N. 1.) (Subj.) "Αλλου του έπιμελήσει, ή οπως ότι βέλτιστοι πολίται ώμεν; PLAT. Gorg. 515 B. Παρασκευάζεσθαι ὅπως σὺν θεῷ ἀγωνιζώμεθα. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. Ι, 5, 14. Οὐ γὰρ ὅπως πλείονος ἄξιος γένηται ἐπιμελείται, ἀλλ' ὅπως αὐτὸς ὅτι πλείστα ὡραῖα καρπώσεται. (Subj. and Fut. combined.) XEN Symp. VIII, 25.

(Fut. Opt.) Έζη ὑπὸ πολλῆς ἐπιμελείας ὅπως ὡς ἐλάχιστα μὲν ὅψοιτο, ἐλάχιστα δ' ἀκούσοιτο, ἐλάχιστα δ' ἔροιτο. ΧΕΝ. Oecon. VII, 5. (Here the construction after a primary tense would be, ὅπως ὄψεται . . . ἀκούσεται . . . ἔρηται.) Ἐπεμελεῖτο ὅπως μὴ ἄσιτοί ποτε ἔσοιντο. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 1, 43. See the other ex-

amples of the Future Optative under § 26, Note 1 (a).

(Fut. Ind. after Secondary Tenses.) "Επρασσον ὅπως τις βοήθεια ήξει. Τηυς. ΗΙ, 4. Προθυμηθέντος ένδς έκάστου ὅπως ἡ ναῦς προέξει. Τηυς. VI, 31. Εὐλαβείσθαι παρεκελεύεσθε ἀλλήλοις, ὅπως μὴ λήσετε διαφθαρέντες. Ρ.Α.Τ. Gorg. 487 D. Οὐδ' ὅπως ὀρθὴ πλεύσεται προείδετο, ἀλλὰ καθ' αὐτὸν ὅπως ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἔσται παρεσκεύασεν. DEM. F. L. 419, 28.

(Pres. or Aor. Opt.) Έπεμέλετο αὐτῶν, ὅπως ἀεὶ ἀνδράποδα δια.

τελοῖευ. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 1, 44. Απεκρίνατο, ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλοι ὅπως καλῶς ἔχοι. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Ι, 8, 13. Ἐμεμελήκει δὲ αὐτοῖς ὅπως ὁ ἱππαγρέτης εἰδείη οὺς δέοι πέμπειν. ΧΕΝ. Hell. III, 3, 9.

(Subj. after Secondary Tenses.) "Επραστεν ὅπως πόλεμος γενηται. Τηυς. Ι, 57. "Επραστον ὅπως ἀποστίν σωσιν 'Αθηναίων τὴν
πόλιν. Id. III, 70. 'Ωνείται παρ' αὐτῶν ὅπως μὴ ἀπίωμεν ἐκ Μακεδοιίας. he bribed them to effect that we should not leave Macedonia
Dem. Cor. 236, 12. (Subj. after Historic Present.)

It will thus be seen that the Future Indicative is the moscommon construction in these sentences, after both primary and secondary tenses; the Future Optative, which is theoretically the regular form after secondary tenses, being rarely used, for the reason stated in § 26. Note 2.

For the distinction between these object clauses and final clauses, see § 43, Remark.

REMARK. "Οπως (like ως) is originally a relative adverb, meaning as. See Thuc. VII, 67, οὕτως, ὅπως δύνανται, as they can. Then it is used in indirect questions, in the sense of ὅτφ τρόπφ, how, in what way, and is followed by the Future Indicative; as σκοπεῖν ὅπως ἡ πόλις σωθήσεται, to see how the city shall be saved. So τοῖς πονηροῖς, ὅπως μὴ δώσουσι δίκην, ὁδὸν δείκνυσι, he shows them how they can avoid suffering punishment (ὅτφ τρόπφ μὴ δώσουσι). Dem. Timoc. 733, 20. (See below, Note 2.) Then, by a slight modification in sense, it may denote also the object to which the striving, &c., is directed; so that σκοπεῖν (οτ σκοπεῖν τοῦτο) ὅπως ἡ πόλις σωθήσεται may mean to see (to this, viz.) that the city shall be saved. Here, however, the Subjunctive is sometimes allowed, as the interrogative force of ὅπως is lost sight of, and its force as a final particle, meaning in order that, begins to appear. E. g.

Σκόπει ὅπως μὴ ἔξαρνος ἔσει ἃ νῦν λέγεις, see that you do not deny what you now say. Plat. Euthyd. 283 C. Σκεπτέον ἐστὶν ὅπως ἐλάχιστα μὲν τραύματα λάβωμεν, ὡς ἐλάχιστα δὲ σώματα ἀνδρῶν ἀποβάλωμεν, we must see that we receive as few wounds as possible, and that we lose as few men's lives as possible. Xen. An. IV, 6, 10.*

From this it becomes established as a final particle, and denotes the purpose in ordinary final clauses. From the original force of $\tilde{o}\pi\omega s$ as a relative, used in indirect questions in the sense of how, we

^{*} Compare Dem. Megal. 207, 5, σκοπεῖν ἐξ ὅτου τρόπου μὴ γενήσονται (φίλοι), to see in what way they can be prevented from becoming friends; and Thuc. I, 65, ἔπρασσεν ὅπη ὡφελία τις γενήσεται, he was effecting that, &c.; quoted by Madvig, Syntax, p. 125, whose views in the main are given in the text, above. See also Thuc. IV, 128, ἔπρασσεν ὅτφ τρότφ τάχιστα τοῖς μὲν ξυμβήσεται τῶν δὲ ἀπαλλάξεται.

must explain its occasional use in indirect quotations in the sense of $\dot{\omega}_s$ or $\ddot{\sigma}_{tt}$ (§ 78). See also § 65, 1, Rem.

Note 1. ${}^{\circ}\text{O}\pi\omega s$ in this construction sometimes (though rarely) takes the particle $\tilde{a}\nu$ when it is followed by the Subjunctive; never, when it is followed by the Future Indicative. Its use is the same as in ordinary final clauses (§ 44, 1, N. 2).

When $\tilde{a}\nu$ is used with the Optative after a verb of striving, it denotes an ordinary apodosis, as in § 44, 1, N. 3 (b), and $\tilde{o}\pi\omega$ s is

simply interrogative. E. g.

*Η ἄλλου ἐφιέμενοι δικάσουσιν ἡ τούτου, ὅπως ἃν ἕκαστοι μήτ ἔχωσι τὰλλότρια μήτε τῶν αὐτῶν στέρωνται; ΡιΑΤ. Rep. IV, 433 Ε. Ἑὰν δ' ἔλθη, μηχανητέον, ὅπως ἃν διαφύγη καὶ μὴ δῷ δίκην δ ἐχθρός. Id. Gorg. 481 Α. Μᾶλλον ἡ πρόσθεν εἰσήει αὐτοὺς ὅπως ἃν καὶ ἔχοντές τι οἰκαδε ἀφίκωνται. ΧΕΝ. Απ. VI, 1, 17. (Here ἐπιμέλεια or some such word is understood as the subject of εἰσήει.) Σκοπῶ, ὅπως ἃν ὡς ῥᾶστα διάγοιεν, ἡμεῖς δ' ἃν μάλιστα ἃν εὐφραινοίμεθα θεώμενοι αὐτούς, I try to see how they might (if they should choose) live the easiest lives, &c. ΧΕΝ. Symp. VII, 2. So ἐπιμεληθήναι ὅπως ἃν γένοιτο, Id. Cyr. I, 6, 7.

Note 2. (a.) The Homeric construction which most resembles that of § 45 is found after such verbs as φράζομαι, βουλεύω, λεύσσω, οr μερμηρίζω, to consider, and πειράω, to try. Here ὅπως or ὡς is used with the Subjunctive (sometimes with κέ) after primary tenses, and with the Optative after secondary tenses. E. g.

Αὐτοὶ δὲ φραζώμεθ΄ ὅπως ὅχ' ἄριστα γένηται, let us ourselves consider how the very best things may be done. Od. XIII, 365. Φραζόμεθ' (imperf.) ᾿Αργείοισιν ὅπως ὅχ' ἄριστα γένοιτο. Od. III, 129. Φράζεσθαι ὅππως κε μνηστῆρας κτείνης. Od. I. 295. Περιφραζώμεθα πάντες νόστον, ὅπως ἔλθησιν, ἱ. e. how he may come. Od. I, 76. Φράσσεται ὥς κε νέηται, ἐπεὶ πολυμήχανός ἐστιν. Od. I, 205. Ἦμα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω λεύσσει, ὅπως ὅχ' ἄριστα γένηται, ἰ. e. he looks to see how, &c. II. III, 110. Μερμήριζεν ὅπως ἀπολοίατο πάσαι νῆες. Od. IX, 554. Μερμήριζε κατὰ φρένα ὡς ᾿Αχιλῆα τιμήση (οτ τιμήσει), ὶ. e. how he might honor Achilles. II. II, β. Βούλευον ὅπως ὅχ' ἄριστα γένοιτο. Od. IX. 420. Πείρα ὅπως κεν δὴ σὴν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἵκηαι, ὶ. e. try to find means by which you may go, &c. Od. IV. 545. Πειγὰ ὧς κε Τρῶες ὑπερφίαλοι ἀπόλλωνται. II. XXI, 459.

Τρώεσσιν, Π. VI, 361; φραζέσθω μή τίς οἱ ἀμείνων σεῖο μάχηται, Π. V, 411. See also Od. VI. 113.

- (b.) In Homer $\delta\pi\omega_s$ takes the Future Indicative chiefly when it is used merely as an indirect interrogative, with no reference to a purpose, as in Il. II, 252, où dé ti $\pi\omega$ oá ϕ a idhev δ π ω s $\tilde{\epsilon}$ o τ at τ áde $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\gamma a$, we do not yet even know certainly how these things are to be; or in Od. XIII, 376, $\phi\rho a'_{0}(\tilde{\epsilon}v)$ $\delta\pi\omega_s$ $\mu\nu\eta\sigma\tau\tilde{\eta}\rho\sigma\nu$ dvadéeu $\chi\tilde{\epsilon}l\rho$ as $\hat{\epsilon}$ ψ $\hat{\eta}$ σ ϵ ι ι consider how you will lay hands on the shameless suitors. It may take the Future (as well as other tenses) when it is used as a simple relative; as in Il. I, 136, $\delta\pi\omega_s$ $\delta\nu\tau a'_{0}$ $\delta\nu$ σ τ a_{0} , as shall be an equivalent. (See Remark, above.) Occasionally also we find the Future after $\delta\pi\omega_s$ in final clauses (§ 44, 1, N. 1).
- Note 3. As many verbs of this class imply caution, they may be followed by the simple $\mu\dot{\eta}$ (without $\delta\pi\omega s$), like verbs of caution and fearing (§ 46). See especially $\delta\rho\hat{\omega}$ and $\sigma\kappa\sigma\pi\hat{\omega}$. Here, as elsewhere, $\mu\dot{\eta}$ takes the Subjunctive more frequently than the Future Indicative. E. g.

Σκοπεί δή μή τούτοις αύτον έξαιτήσηται καὶ καταγελάση. . Dem. Mid. 563, 26. 'Όρα οὖν μή τι καὶ νῦν ἐργάσηται. Plat. Symp. 213 D. 'Όρα μἡ πολλῶν ἐκάστω ἡμῶν χειρῶν δεήσει. Χεν. Cyr. IV, 1, 18. Σκόπει, μή σοι πρόνοι ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ ψυλακτέα. Soph. O. C. 1180. 'Όρα σὺ, μὴ νῦν μέν τις εὐχερὴς παρῆς. Soph. Phil. 519.

(See the corresponding use of $\delta \pi \omega s \mu \eta$, instead of $\mu \eta$, after verbs of fearing, &c., § 46, Note 2. It is often difficult to draw the line between the two constructions of § 45 and § 46.)

Note 4. 'Os is sometimes, though rarely, used instead of $\~o\pi\omega$ s after verbs of striving. Here the Subjunctive is more common than the Future Indicative. E. g.

Ἐπιμελοῦνται ὡς ἔχη οὕτως. ΧΕΝ. Oecon. ΧΧ, 8. 'Ως δὲ καλῶς ἔξει τὰ ὑμέτερα, ἐμοὶ μελήσει. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. III, 2, 13. Ἐπεμελήθη ὡς τὑχοιεν πάντων τῶν καλῶν. Id. VII, 3, 17. Σπεύδοντες ὡς Ζεὺς μήποτ' ἄρξειεν θεῶν. Aesch. Prom. 203. Occasionally we find the Subjunctive with ἄν: τὸ ὅτα ἀν γνῷ ἀγαθὰ εἶναι ἐπιμελεῖσθαι ὡς ἀν πραχθῆ · · · · Οὐ ψέρει καρπὸν, ἡν μή τις ἐπιμελῆται ὡς ἀν ταῦτα περαίνηται. ΧΕΝ. Hipparch. IX, 2. (See above, N. 1.)

- Note 5. Some verbs which are regularly followed by an Infinitive of the object occasionally take an object clause with $\delta\pi\omega s$ (rarely with other particles), in nearly or quite the same sense:—
- (a.) Verbs of exhorting, entreating, and commanding are sometimes followed by ὅπως, and those of forbidding by ὅπως μή, after the analogy of verbs of striving. E. g.

Λίσσεσθαι δέ μιν αὐτλς ὅπως νημερτέα εἴπη, and implore him thyself to speak the truth. Od. III, 19. (Compare the regular con struction, οὐδέ σε λίσσομας μένειν, II. I, 174.) Λίσσετο δ' αἰεὶ Ἡφαιστον κλυτοεργὸν ὅπως λύσειεν "Αρηα, he implored him to liberate Ares. Od. VIII, 344. Κείνω τ' ἐμὴν ἀγγείλατ' ἐντολὴν, ὅπως τὸν παίδα δείξει. Soph. Α΄, 567. Διακελεύονται ὅπως τιμωρήσεται πάντας τοὺς τοιούτους. Plat. Rep. VIII, 549 Ε. So παραγγέλλει ὅπως μὴ ἔσονται, Id. III, 415 Β. "Εμοιγε ἀπηγόρευες ὅπως μὴ τοῦτο ἀποκρινοίμην. (Fut. Opt.) Id. I, 339 Α. Απειρημένον αὐτῷ ὅπως μηδέν ἐρεῖ ὧν ἡγεῖται, when he is forbidicen to say a word of what he believes. Id. I, 337 Ε. See Soph. Trach. 604.

In Od. XVII, 362, we find ωτρυνεν ως αν πύρνα κατά μνηστήρας αγείροι, where the αν is used with the particle as in the examples

under § 44, 1, N. 3 (a).

(b.) "Iva is used in the same sense in a single passage of the Odyssey, III, 327: — Λίσσεσθαι δέ μιν αὐτὸς ἵνα νημερτὲς ἐνίσπη, and implore him yourself to speak the truth.

This use of "tva is not found in Attic Greek, but it reappears in

the later language. E. g.

Ἐντολήν καινήν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, a new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another. Joh. Evang. XIII, 34. So ἐδεήθην ἵνα ἐκβάλλωσιν, Luc. IX, 40. So in Latin, rogat ut liceat.

(c.) A case of ω_s and the Subjunctive (instead of an object Infinitive) after a verb implying a promise is found in II. I, 558:—

Τἢ σ' ὀίω κατανεῦσαι ἐτήτυμον, ὡς 'Αχιλῆα τιμήσης, ὀλέσης δὲ πολέας ἐπὶ νηυσὶν 'Αχαιῶν, that you promised by your nod to honor Achilles, &c.

NOTE 6. (a.) On the other hand, some verbs which regularly take $\delta \pi \omega s$ are occasionally found with an Infinitive of the object,

sometimes with the article. (See § 46, N. 8.) E. g.

'Aεί τινα ἐπεμέλοντο σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς εἶναι, they always took care that one of their own number should be in the offices (where we should expect ὅπως τις ἔσται οτ ἔσοιτο). ΤΗυς. VI, 54. Οὐδ' ἐπεμελήθην τοῦ διδασκαλόν μοί τινα γενέσθαι τῶν ἐπισταμένων. ΧΕΝ. Μεm. IV, 2, 4. So the Infinitive with τό, Mem. IV, 3, 1.

(b.) Verbs of this class can be followed by an indirect question introduced by ϵl , whether. E. g.

El ξυμπονήσεις και ξυνεργάσει σκόπει, see whether thou wilt assist me, &c. Soph. Ant. 41. (See § 46, Note 6, c.)

NOTE 7. (a.) Both ὅπως and ὅπως μή are sometimes used elliptically with the Future Indicative in exhortations and prohibitrons, depending on some Imperative like σκόπει, take care, understood. "Οπως μή allows also the Subjunctive. E. g.

"Οπως ἀνὴρ ἔσει (SC. σκιπει), prove thyself a man. ΤΟπως μοι,

δ ἄνθρωπε, μὴ ἐρεῖς ὅτι ἔστι τὰ δώδεκα δὶς ἔξ, see that you do not tell me that twice six are twelve. Plat. Rep. I, 337 A. "Οπως οὖν ἔσεσθε ἄνδρες ἄξιοι τῆς ἐλευθερίας (sc. σκοπεῖτε), prove yourselves men worthy of freedom. Xen. An. I, 7, 3. "Οπως γε, ἄν τι τούτων γίγνηται, τούτους ἐπαινέσεσθε καὶ τιμήσετε καὶ στεφανώσετε, ἐμὲ δὲ μή· καὶ μέντοι κᾶν τι τῶν ἐναντίων, ὅπως τούτοις ὀργιεῖσθε. Dem. F. L. 355, 17. "Οπως τοίνυν περὶ τοῦ πολέμου μηδὲν ἐρεῖς, see therefore that you say nothing about the war. Id. 370, 22. "Οπως γε μὴ ἐξαπατήση ἡμᾶς. Plat. Prot. 313 C. (See § 46, N. 4.)

(b.) We occasionally find the Future Indicative with $\mu \hat{\eta}$ in an independent sentence, expressing a prohibition. This may be explained by supposing an ellipsis of $\delta \pi \omega s$ from the construction just mentioned $(\delta \pi \omega s \ \mu \hat{\eta} \ \tau o \hat{\tau} \tau o \hat{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota} s$ becoming $\mu \hat{\eta} \ \tau o \hat{\tau} \tau o \hat{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota} s$; but it seems more natural to consider it as an independent construction. See § 25, 1, N. 5 (b), and the examples.

REMARK. The construction of Note 7 (a) is confined almost exclusively to the second person of the verb; yet the first and third persons are sometimes found. E. g.

Καὶ ὅπως, ὥσπερ ἐρωτῶσι προθύμως, οὖτω καὶ ποιεῖν ἐθελή-σουσιν. Dem. Chers. 99, 14. "Οπως δὲ τὸ σύμβολον λαβόντες ἔπειτα πλησίον καθεδούμεθα. Arist. Eccles. 297.

Note 8. When an Aorist Subjunctive active or middle was to be used with $\delta\pi\omega_s$ or $\delta\pi\omega_s$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ after a verb of striving, the second Aorist was preferred to the first, if both forms were in use. This arose from the great similarity in form between these first Aorists and the Future Indicative (as $\beta ou\lambda\epsilon\dot{u}\sigma\eta$ and $\beta ou\lambda\epsilon\dot{u}\sigma\epsilon_t$, $\beta ou\lambda\epsilon\dot{u}\sigma\eta\tau$ and $\beta ou\lambda\epsilon\dot{u}\sigma\epsilon\tau a$): this made it natural for a writer, if he intended to use the Subjunctive at all, to avoid those forms of it which were nearly identical with the more regular Future Indicative. This of course did not apply to the first Aorist Subjunctive passive, which has no resemblance to the Future Indicative. The same remark applies to the Subjunctive after $o\dot{u}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$, in the construction described in § 89. In both constructions the Subjunctive differs from the Future only by being a less vivid form of expression.*

^{*} The general rule, first laid down by Dawes (Misc. Crit. pp. 222 and 228), which declared the first Aorist Subjunctive active and middle a solecism after $\delta\pi\omega s$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ and $o\dot{v}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$, was extended by others so as to include $\delta\pi\omega s$ (without $\mu\dot{\eta}$), and the Greek authors were emended to conform to it. As this rule has no other foundation than the accidental circumstance mentioned in Note 8, it naturally fails in many cases, in some of which even emendation is impossible. Thus in the example, $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\dot{v}ou\sigma\iota$ $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\tau a\tau\dot{\epsilon}\dot{v}\sigma\iota$ $\delta\pi\omega s$ $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\dot{v}\sigma\eta$ $\dot{\dot{\eta}}$ $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\iota\dot{\dot{\alpha}}$, Xen. An V, 6, 22, $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\dot{v}\sigma\eta$ cannot be a mistake for $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\dot{v}\sigma\epsilon\iota$, as the Attic Future is $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\dot{v}\sigma\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ or $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\dot{v}\sigma\eta\nu\dot{\alpha}\iota$. So in Soph. Phil. 381, où $\dot{\mu}\dot{\eta}$ $\pi\sigma\dot{\tau}$ $\dot{\epsilon}s$ $\tau\dot{\eta}\nu$ $\Sigma\kappa\dot{\nu}\rho\rho\omega$ $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\dot{v}\sigma\eta s$, no emendation is possible. See also Plat. Rep. X, 609 B. $\dot{v}\dot{\nu}\dot{\eta}$ $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\sigma}\eta$, where the Future would be $\dot{\alpha}\pio\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}$. The rule of

- C. Object Clauses with un after Verbs of Fearing, &c.
- § 46. After verbs and phrases which express of imply fear, caution, or danger, $\mu \dot{\eta}$, lest or that, is used with the Subjunctive if the leading verb is primary, and with the Optative if the leading verb is secondary. By the principle of § 44, 2, the Subjunctive can also follow secondary tenses, in order that the mood in which the object of the fear originally occurred to the mind may be retained.

 M'_{η} (like the Latin ne) denotes fear that something may happen which is not desired; $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ov (ut = ne non) denotes fear that something may not happen which is desired.E. g.

Φοβοῦμαι μὴ γένηται (vereor ne accidat), I fear that it may happen: φοβουμαι μή οὐ γένηται (vereor ut accidat), I fear that it may not happen. Νου δ' αίνως δείδοικα κατά φρένα μή σε παρείπη. Il. I. 555. Δείδω μή θήρεσσιν έλωρ καὶ κύρμα γενωμαι. Od. V, 473. Οὐ φοβή μή σ' "Αργος ὥσπερ κἄμ' ἀποκτείναι θέλη. Eur. Or. 770. Ποίον έθνος οὐ δοκεί φοβούμενον μή τι πάθη; ΧΈΝ. Cyr. I, 6, 10. Φροντίζω μή κράτιστον ή μοι σιγάν. ΧΕΝ. Μεm. IV, 2, 39. Φυλαττόμενος μη δόξη μανθάνειν τι. Id. IV, 2, 3. Δέδοικα μη οὐδ ὅστον η ἀπαγορεύειν. Plat. Rep. II, 368 B. Τὰ περί τῆς ψυχῆς πολλήν

Dawes is now generally abandoned; but most editors still hold to it (at least in practice) so far as to exclude the prohibited forms with ὅπως when it follows verbs of striving, &c., and with ou un. Even here, however, the rule is maintained only by changing many passages against Mss. authority. Thus in Dem. Ol. I, p. 9, 17, all Mss. except one read παρασκευάσασθαι όπως ενθένδε βοηθήσητε, και μη πάθητε ταὐτόν, while nearly all editions have βοηθήσετε. In the Third Philippic of Demosthenes two similar examples occur: p. 128, 25, οπως μηδείς ανατρέψει, τοῦτο σκοπείσθαι, where all Mss. have ανατρέψη, which Schaefer emended to ἀνατρέψει; and p. 125, 10, ὅπως μη δουλεύσουσιν πράττοντες, where the weight of Mss. authority decidedly favors δουλεύσωσιν. For οὐ μή, see § 89, 2, Rem. 2.

Whatever view is taken of these last examples, there certainly seems to be no reason for extending the rule of Dawes to ὅπωs in pure final clauses, as in these the Future is used only by exception (§ 44, 1, N. 1). There is no objection, therefore, to such sentences as these: - ων ενεκα επιταθηναι, ὅπως ἀπολαύσωμεν καὶ ὅπως γενώμεθα, Χεκ. Cyr VII, 5, 82; and ἐκκλησίαν ξυνήγαγον, ὅπως ὑπομνήσω καὶ μέμψωμαι, Τημο. II. 60. So with όπως αριστοποιήσωνται, Τημο. VII, 39. In elliptical prohibitions with $\~o\pi\omega s$ $\mu\'\eta$ (§ 45, N. 7) the Subjunctive seems to be allowed from the analogy of ordinary prohibitions (§ 86).

ἀπιστίαν παρέχει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, μὴ ἐπειδὰν ἀπαλλαγῆ τοῦ σώματος οὐδαμοῦ ἔτι ἢ, ἀλλὰ διαφθείρηταί τε καὶ ἀπολλύηται. Plat. Phaed. 70 A. Οὐκοῦν νῦν καὶ τοῦτο κίνδυνος, μὴ λάβωσι προστάτας αὐτῶν τινας τούτων, there is danger of this, that they may take, &c. ΧΕΝ. Απ. VΗ, 7, 31. Κίνδυνός ἐστι. μὴ μεταβάλωνται καὶ γένωνται μετὰ τῶν πολεμίων. ISOC. Plataic. p. 303 Ε. § 38. ᾿Οκνῶ μή μοι ὁ Λυσίας ταπεινὸς φαν ἢ. Plat. Phaedr. 257 C. Εὐλαβοῦ δὲ μὴ φαν ἢς κακὸς γεγώς. SOPH. Trach. 1129. Οὐδὲν δεινοὶ ἔσονται μὴ βοηθέωσι ταύτη. Hdt. VH, 235. Ὑποπτεύομεν καὶ ὑμᾶς μὴ οὐ κοινοὶ ἀποβῆτε. ΤΗυC. Η, 53. Αἰσχυνόμενος μὴ φορτικῶς σκοπῶμεν. Plat. Theact. 183 Ε.

Δείσας μή πώς οἱ ἐρυσαίατο νεκρὸν 'Αχαιοί. Π. V, 298. ''Αζετο γὰρ μὴ Νυκτὶ θοῆ ἀποθύμια ἔρδοι. Π. ΧΙV, 261. 'Εγὼ γὰρ ῆμην εκπεπληγμένη φόβω, μή μοι τὸ κάλλος ἄλγος ἐξεύροι ποτέ. SOPH. Trach. 25. ''Εδείσαν οἱ ''Ελληνες μὴ προσάγοιεν πρὸς τὸ κέρας και αὐτοὺς κατακόψειαν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Ι, 10, 9. Οὐκέτι ἐπετίθεντο, δεδοικότες μὴ ἀποτμηθείησαν. Ιd. ΙΙΙ, 4, 29. ''Εδείσαν μὴ λύττα τις ὅσπερ κυσὶν ἡμῖν ἐμπεπτώκοι. Id. V, 7, 26. 'Υποπτεύσας μὴ τὴν θυγατέρα λέγοι, ἤρετο, having suspected that he might mention his daughter. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. V, 2, 9. 'Ηθύμησάν τινες, ἐννοούμενοι μὴ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια οὐκ ἔχοιεν ὁπόθεν λαμβάνοιεν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙΙ, 5, 3. Οὐδεὶς γὰρ κίνδυνος ἐδόκει εἶναι, μή τις ἄνω πορευομένων ἐκ τοῦ ὅπισθεν ἐπίσποιτο. Id. IV, 1, 6.

Οἱ Φωκαίεες τὰς νήσους οὖκ ἐβούλοντο πωλίειν, δειμαίνοντες μὴ ἐμπόριον γένωνται. ΗDT. I, 165. Τῷ γὰρ δεδιέναι μὴ λόγοις ήσσους ὦσι, τολμηρῶς πρὸς τὰ ἔργα ἐχώρουν. ΤΗUC. III, 83. Περιδεὴς γενόμενος μὴ ἐπιπλεύσωσιν αὶ νῆςς. ΤΗUC. III, 80. "Εδεισα μὴ Τροίαν ἀθροίση καὶ ξυνοικίση πάλιν. ΕUR. Hec. 1138. Οἱ θεώμενοι ἐφοβοῦντο μή τι πάθη. ΧΕΝ. Symp. II, 11. Δῆλος ἦν πᾶσιν (Κῦρος) ὅτι ὑπερεφοβεῖτο μή οἱ ὁ πάππος ἀποθάνη. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I,

4, 2.

It will be seen by the examples that the construction with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ is very often used when the leading verb only implies the fear, caution, or danger, as after $i\pi o\pi \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega$ and $i\kappa \nu \dot{\omega}$. On this principle we must explain passages like II. X, 100; $i\partial \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \tau i \, i\partial_{\mu} \epsilon \nu$, $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \omega s \kappa \dot{\alpha} i \, \dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\kappa} \tau a \, \mu \epsilon \nu c \nu \dot{\eta} \dot{\tau} \omega \omega i \, \mu \dot{\alpha} \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, where the idea is we know of no security against their deciding to fight during the night, — implying we fear lest they may.

Remark. These clauses with $\mu\dot{\eta}$, when they follow verbs of caution like $\phi \nu \lambda \dot{\alpha} \tau \sigma \mu a\iota$, $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \sigma \dot{\nu} \mu a\iota$, &c., partake of the nature of final clauses to the same extent with the construction of § 45, since they imply the end or purpose of the caution. (See § 43, Remark.) On the other hand, when they follow $\phi \sigma \beta \sigma \dot{\nu} \mu a\iota$ and other verbs expressing fear or danger, no purpose is expressed or implied, but there is merely an apprehension that something will happen, or, in some cases, that something is now taking place or has already happened. We should hence expect that these verbs would follow the analogy of verbs of thinking, &c., and take either the Indicative with $\dot{\phi}$ s or the Infinitive, to denote the object of the fear. (This

actually happens in a few cases; as οὐ φοβούμεθα ἐλισσώσεσθαι, ΤΗυC. V, 105; μὴ φοβοῦ ὡς ἀπορήσεις, ΧΕΝ. Cyr. V, 2, 12. See below, Note 6.) Still, verbs of fearing, when the object of the fear is future, as it commonly is, are closely connected in sense with those like φυλάττομαι; as they imply at least a desire (though not a purpose) to prevent the result. The Greeks generally apply to both the same construction, and as they say φυλάττομαι μη γένηται, they say also φοβούμαι μη γένηται. When the object of the fear is already past or actually present, so that no desire of preventing a result can be implied, verbs of fearing are still followed by $\mu\eta$ as before; but now all analogy to final clauses disappears, and the dependent verb is put in the proper tense of the Indicative, as in ordinary object clauses after on and os. (See below, Note 5.)

Note 1. Sometimes, though seldom, un takes the Future Indicative after verbs of fearing, &c. E. g.

Φοβούμαι δέ, μή τινας ήδονας ήδοναις εύρήσομεν έναντίας. PLAT. Phil. 13 A. Φοβερον και σφαλερον, μή σφαλείς κείσομαι. Plat. Rep. V, 451 A.

The Future seems to differ from the Subjunctive in these cases, as in final clauses, only by expressing the result more vividly and marking its futurity more strongly. Thus φοβοῦμαι μη εὖρωμεν would not differ from φοβοῦμαι μη εύρησομεν quoted above, except in the manner of expression; just as έαν μη ευρωμεν would differ from εἰ μὴ εύρησομεν. (See § 44, 1, N. 1.) For the rare use of the Future Optative after verbs of fearing, &c., see § 26, Note 1 (b).

Note 2. Verbs denoting fear and caution are sometimes followed by ὅπως μή, with the Future Indicative or the Subjunctive after primary tenses and the Optative after secondary tenses, like verbs of striving, &c. Many verbs (like opo and σκοπῶ) belong equally well to both classes (§§ 45, 46). It will be noticed, that ὅπως μή here is exactly equivalent to μή, so that φοβούμαι όπως μη γενήσεται (or γένηται) means I fear that it will happen (not, I fear that it will not happen). (See Note 6, a.) E. g.

Τοῦ δαίμονος δέδοιχ' ὅπως μὴ τεύξομαι κακοδαίμονος. ΑRIST. Eq. 112. Εὐλαβούμενοι ὅπως μη οἰχήσομαι. PLAT. Phaed. 91 C. Δέδοικα ὅπως μη ἀνάγκη γένηται, I fear that there may be a necessity. Dem. Phil. III, 130, 14. Οὐ φοβεῖ, ὅπως μη ἀνόσιον πραγμα τυγχάνης πράττων; Plat. Euthyphr. 4 Ε. Φυλάττου, ὅπως μὴ εἰς τουναντίον ἔλθης. ΧΕΝ. Μεπ. ΙΙΙ, 6, 16. Ἡδέως ἃν (θρέψαιμι τὸν ανδρα), εί μη φοβοίμην ο πως μη έπ' αὐτόν με τράποιτο. ΧΕΝ. Μεπ. II, 9, 2.

Note 3. The particle dv is never used with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ and the Sub-

junctive. It is sometimes joined with an Optative depending upon $\mu\dot{\eta}$ after verbs of *fearing*, in which case it always forms an apodosis with the Optative. Such an Optative with $\ddot{a}\nu$ can of course follow primary as well as secondary tenses, by § 31, Note 2. (See § 44, 1, N. 3, Rem.) E. g.

Δέδοικα γὰρ μὴ πρῷ λέγοις ἃν τὰν πόθον τὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ, I fear that you might tell (if you should have an opportunity). Soph. Trach. 631. (Cf. Philoct. 493.) Οὔτε προσδοκία οὐδεμία ἦν μὴ ἄν ποτε οἱ πολέμιω ἐπιπλεύσειαν. Τhuc. II, 93. Ἐκεῖνο ἐννοῶ μὴ λίαν ἃν ταχὺ σωφρονισθείην, lest (in that case) I should be very soon brought to my senses. Xen. An. VI, 1, 28.

Note 4. Mή with the Subjunctive, and $\delta\pi\omega s$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ with the Future Indicative (seldom the Subjunctive), are sometimes used elliptically, depending upon some verb of fear or caution understood. (See § 45, N. 7, α .) This expresses an apprehension or anxiety, sometimes a mere suspicion. It is especially common in Plato. E. g.

'Αλλὰ μὴ οὐ τοῦτ' ἢ χαλεπὸν, θάνατον φυγεῖν, but (I fear) lest this may not be the difficult thing, to avoid death. Plat. Apol. 39 A. Μὴ ἀγροικότερον ἢ τὸ ἀληθὲς εἰπεῖν, (I fear) lest it may be too rude to speak the truth. Plat. Gorg. 462 E. 'Αλλὰ μὴ οὐχ οὕτως ἔχη, ἀλλ' ἀναγκαῖον ἢ εἰδότα τίθεσθαι τὸν τιθέμενον τὰ ὀνόματα. Plat. Crat. 436 B. Οἴμοι τάλας, ὁ Ζεὺς ὅπως μή μ' ὄψ εται. Arist. Av. 1494. (This example belongs equally well under § 45, N. 7, α.) "Όπως οὖν μὴ ἀπολεῖ μαστιγούμενος. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 3, 18. 'Αλλ' ὅπως μὴ ἐν τοῖς ζωγραφήμασιν ἢ τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ ὀρθῶς διανέμειν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν οὖ, ἀλλ' ἀναγκαῖον ἢ ἀεὶ ὀρθῶς. Plat. Crat. 430 E.

In Xen. Mem. IV, 2, 12, μη οὖν, ἔφη, οὐ δύναμαι ἐγὼ τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐξηγήσασθαι; (do you fear) I am not able to explain, &c.?

the Present Indicative belongs under Note 5 (a.)

- Note 5. Verbs of fearing may refer to objects of fear which are past or immediately present; so that no desire or even possibility of preventing the result can be implied. (See Rem. before Note 1.) Here, therefore, all analogy to final clauses disappears, and $\mu \dot{\eta}$ is followed by the present and past tenses of the Indicative, as $\delta \tau_i$ or $\dot{\delta}_S$ would be in indirect quotations. The following cases occur:—
- (a.) My with the Present Indicative expresses a fear that something is now going on. E. g.

'Ορώμεν μὴ Νικίας οἴεται τι λέγειν, let us be cautious lest Nicias is thinking that he says something. Plat. Lach. 196 C. (Here the Subjunctive οἴηται would have meant lest Nicias may think, referring to the future.) Δέδοικα μὴ πληγών δέει. ARIST. Nub. 493

Φοβείσθε, μὴ δυσκολώτερόν τι νῦν διάκειμαι ἡ ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν βίῳ, you are afraid lest I am now in a more peevish state of mind, &c (where the Subjunctive would have referred to the future, lest I may be). Plat. Phaed. 84 Ε. Ἑπίσχες, ὡς ἐν προύξερευνήσω στίβον μή τις πολιτῶν ἐν τρίβῳ φαντάζεται, κἀμοὶ μὲν ἔλθη φαθλος ὡς δούλῳ ψόγος. Ευκ. Phoen. 92. (Here μὴ φαντάζεται means lest any one is now to be seen; and μὴ ἕλθη, lest any report may come hereafter.) "Αναξ, ἐμοί τοι, μή τι καὶ θεήλατον τούργον τόδ', ἡ ξύννοια βουλεύει πάλαι. Soph. Ant. 278. (The idea is, my mind has long been anxious, lest this is the work of the Gods, ἐστίν being understood after μή.*) "Όρα μὴ ἐκείνον κωλύει. Plat. Charm. 163 A. 'λλλ' εἰσόμεσθα, μή τι καὶ κατάσχετον κρυφῆ καλύπτει καρδία θυμουμένη, δόμους παραστείχοντες. Soph. Ant. 1253. (The idea is, we shall learn the result of our anxiety lest she is concealing, &c.†)

(b.) My with the Perfect Indicative expresses a fear lest something has already happened. The difference between this and the Perfect Subjunctive is often very slight, the latter expressing rather a fear that something may hereafter prove to have happened. (See examples, § 18, 1.) E. g.

Νῦν δὲ φοβούμεθα, μὴ ἀμφοτέρων ἄμα ἡ μαρτήκαμεν, but now we fear lest we have missed both at once. Thuc. III, 53. (The Perfect Subjunctive here would strictly have meant lest it may hereafter prove that we have missed.) Δέδοικα μὴ λελήθαμεν [τὴν εἰρήνην] ἐπὶ πολλῷ ἄγοντες, I fear that we have been unconsciously enjoying a peace borrowed at high interest. DEM. F. L. 372, 1. Φοβούμαι μὴ λόγοις τισὶ ψευδέσιν ἐντετυχήκαμεν. Plat. Lys. 218 D.

^{*} That this is the correct explanation of the passage, Soph. Ant. 278, and that we need not emend it with Nauck, so as to read τοῦργον τόδ' ἢ, ξύννοια βουλεύει πάλαι, is evident from the Scholion on the passage: Ἡ σύννοια μοι βουλεύεται καὶ οἴεται μὴ καὶ θεήλατόν ἐστι τὸ πρᾶγμα. So perhaps we should read μὴ ἐλαύνει in Dem. Phil. III, 124, 25.

[†] In this passage, if anywhere, it would seem necessary to admit the interrogative force usually ascribed to $\mu\dot{\eta}$, which would make it equivalent to ϵl oi, whether not. But here, as in the other passages quoted, it is plain that the dependent clause after $\mu\dot{\eta}$ expresses the object of an apprehension. To establish a purely interrogative force in $\mu\dot{\eta}$, it would seem necessary to find examples in which $\mu\dot{\eta}$ not only follows a verb like olda, but also is followed by a clause in which no object of apprehension is contained (Such a sentence would be $\epsilon l \sigma i \mu \epsilon \sigma l \mu \epsilon l$) of $\phi l ho l$ $\zeta \omega \sigma \iota \nu$, we shall learn whether our friends are not living; but no such example can be found, at least in any classic writer. The Greeks would have said $\epsilon l \sigma i \mu \epsilon \sigma l$ of $\zeta \omega \sigma \iota \nu$. The use of ϵl , whether, after verbs of fearing (Note 6, c), usually adduced as an argument to prove the interrogative force of $\mu\dot{\eta}$, rather seems to show that, when the Greeks wished to introduce an indirect question after verbs of fearing, they had recourse to ϵl , as in other cases.

(c.) Mý can be used with the Imperfect or the Aorist Indicative, to express fear lest something happened in past time. This can be expressed only in this way, as the Subjunctive and Optative would refer to (relatively) future time. E. g.

Δείδω μὴ δὴ πάντα θεὰ νημερτέα εἶπεν, I fear that all that the Goddess said was true. Od. V, 300. 'Αλλ' ὅρα μὴ παίζων ἔλεγεν, but be very careful lest he was speaking in jest. Plat. Theaet. 145 B. (This implies a fear that he was speaking in jest.)

Note 6. (a.) As verbs of fearing, &c., imply thought, they sometimes take the construction of ordinary indirect discourse. Here &s (and even $\delta\pi$ ws), that, may be used to introduce the object of the fear, thus taking the place of $\mu\dot{\eta}$ in the common construction. (Other seems to be used only in the case mentioned in Note 7.) E. g.

'Aνδρὸς μὴ φοβοῦ ὡς ἀπορήσεις ἀξίου, do not fear that you will be at a loss. Xen. Cyr. V, 2, 12. (Here the direct discourse would be ἀπορήσω, I shall be at a loss.) Μὴ δείσητε ὡς ο ὖχ ἡδέως καθευρήσετε, do not fear that you will not sleep sweetly. Id. VI, 2, 30. (Here μὴ οὐχ would be the ordinary expression.) Μὴ τρέσης, ὅπως σέ τις ἀποσπάσει βία, lest any one shall tear you away by force. Eur. Heracl. 248. Μὴ φοβεῦ μήτε ἐμὲ, ὡς σεο πειρώμενος λέγω λόγον τόνδε, μήτε γυναῖκα τὴν ἐμὴν, μἡ τί τοι ἐξ αὐτῆς γένηται Βλάβος, do not fear either that I am saying this to try you (ὡς λέγω), or lest any harm shall come (μἡ γένηται). Hut. I, 9. (Here the two constructions after φοβεῦ make the principle especially clear.)

In all these cases $\mu\dot{\eta}$ or $\delta\pi\omega_{\rm s}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ would have been more regular, and exactly equivalent to $\dot{\omega}_{\rm s}$ and $\delta\pi\omega_{\rm s}$ here. (See Note 2.)

(b.) We also find the Future Infinitive after veros of fearing, standing in indirect discourse to represent a Future Indicative of the direct discourse. (See § 73, 1, Rem.) E. g.

Οὐ φοβούμεθα ἐλασ τώ σεσθαι, we are not afraid that we shall be defeated. Thuc. V, 105. (Here $\mu\dot{\eta}$ with the Subjunctive or the Future Indicative would have been more regular.)

(c.) Verbs of fearing may also be followed by an indirect question introduced by ϵl , whether, or by some other interrogative particle. " $0\pi\omega s$ used interrogatively in such sentences is not to be confounded with $6\pi\omega s$ in its use explained above (a). E. g.

Οὶ δέδοικα εἰ Φίλιππος ζη, ἀλλ' εἰ της πόλεως τέθνηκε τὸ τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας μισεῖν καὶ τιμωρεῖσθαι, Ι have no fear (on the question)

whether Phi'ip is alive; but I have fear (about this), whether the custom of the city to hate and punish evil-doers is extinct. Dem. F. L. 434, 6. Φόβος ε΄ μοι ζῶσιν οῦς ἐγὰ θέλω. EUR. Heracl. 791. Φέρουσά σοι νέους ἡκω λόγους, φόβω μὲν ε΄ τις δεσποτῶν αἰσθήσεται, through fear whether any one will perceive it (where μὴ αἰσθήσεται οτ αἴσθηται might have been used, meaning lest any one shall perceive it). EUR. Androm. 61. Φοβοῦνται ὅποι ποτὲ προβήσεται ἡ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς δύναμις. ΧΕΝ. Hell. VI, 1, 14. (The direct question would be ποῖ προβήσεται;) Τὴν θεὸν δ΄ ὅπως λάθω δέδοικα, I am in fear (about the question) how I shall escape the Goddess. EUR. Iph. T. 995. (The direct question was πῶς λάθω; § 88.)

NOTE 7. Verbs of fearing may be followed by $\delta \tau \iota$, because, and an ordinary causal sentence with the Indicative (§ 81). E. g.

Οὐκ ἄξιον διὰ τοῦτο φοβεῖσθαι τοὺς πολεμίους, ὅτι πολλοὶ τυγχάνουσιν ὅντες, to fear them, because they happen to be many. Isoc. Archid. p. 128 C. § 60. Φοβουμένης τῆς μητρὸς, ὅτι τὸ χωρίον ἐπυνθάνετο νοσῶδες εἶναι. Isoc. Aegin. p. 388 D. § 22. ο Οτι δὲ πολλῶν ἄρχουσι, μὴ φοβηθῆτε, ἀλλὰ πολὺ μᾶλλον διὰ τοῦτο βαρρεῖτε, do not be afraid because they rule many, &c. XEN. Hell. III, 5, 10. (Μὴ ἄρχουσιν φοβεῖσθαι would mean to fear lest they rule.) Φοβούμενος τὸ κάεσθαι καὶ τὸ τέμνεσθαι, ὅτι ἀλγεινόν, fearing them, on the ground that they are painful. Plat. Gorg. 479 A. (But for the analogy of the preceding examples, we might be inclined to translate this fearing that they are painful, like μὴ ἀλγεινόν.) Ἐφοβεῖτο, ὅτι ὀφθήσεσθαι ἔμελλε τὰ βασίλεια οἰκοδομεῖν ἀρχόμενος, he was afraid, because he was about to be seen beginning to build the palace. XEN. Cyr. III, 1, 1.

NOTE 8. (a.) Verbs of fearing may be followed by an Infinitive (without $\mu\dot{\eta}$), which is sometimes preceded by the article. Such an Infinitive denotes the direct object of the fear, as in English, I fear to go. E. g.

Φοβοῦμαι οὖν διελέγχειν σε, μὴ ὑπολάβης, κ.τ.λ., I am afraid to refute you, lest you may suspect, &c. Plat. Gorg. 457 E. (Here both constructions occur) Φοβήσεται ἀδικεῖν, he will be afraid to do wrong. Xen. Cyr. VIII, 7, 15. (But φοβήσεται μὴ ἀδικῆ, he will fear that he may do wrong.) Πέφρικα Ἐρινὺν τόκ όσαι τὰς κατάρας, I shudder at the idea of the Fury fulfilling the curses. Aesth. Sept. 720. (But in 790, τρέω μὴ τελέση means I tremble lest she may fulfil them.) See also Xen. An. I, 3, 17. Τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν οὐδεὶς φοβεῖται, τὸ δὲ ἀδικεῖν φοβεῖται. Plat. Gorg. 522 E.

See § 92, 1, Remark 2, and Note 3.

(b.) Verbs of caution may be followed by an Infinitive (with or without $\mu\dot{\eta}$), which is sometimes preceded by the article; the Infinitive having the same meaning as a clause with $\mu\dot{\eta}$ and the Subjunctive or Optative. E. g.

Πως οὐκ ἄξιον αὐτόν γε φυλάξασθαι τοιοῦτον γενέσθαι; why

ought he not to guard against becoming such a man himself? Xen. Mem I, 5, 3. (Here γενέσθαι is equivalent to μη γένηται.) Φυλαττόμενος τὸ λυπησαί τινα, taking care to offend no one. Dem. Cor. 313, 6. Φυλάσσειν μηδένα περαιοῦσθαι. Τηυς. VII, 17. Φυλαττόμενον καὶ προορώμενον μὴ καταισχῦναι ταύτην. [Dem.] Aristog. I, 773, 1. (For μή see § 95, 2, N. 1.) In Thuc. VII, 77, 5, we find the Infinitive with ωστε after φυλάσσω.

(c.) Kivδvvós ἐστι, the principal expression denoting danger which takes $\mu\dot{\eta}$ and a finite verb, is quite as regularly followed by the Infinitive (without $\mu\dot{\eta}$). E. g.

Οὐ σμικρὸς κίνδυνός ἐστιν ἐξαπατηθῆναι, there is no little danger of their being deceived. Plat. Crat. 436 B.

Κινδυνεύω is regularly followed by the Infinitive, by § 92, 1.

REMARK. All the Infinitives referred to in Note 8 belong regularly under the rule, § 92, 1. For the article before such Infinitives see § 92, 1, Note 3.

SECTION II.

CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.

§ 47. 1. In conditional sentences the clause containing the condition is called the *protasis*, and that containing the conclusion is called the *apodosis*. The protasis is regularly introduced by the particle ϵi , if, negatively $\epsilon i \mu \hat{\eta}$.

Note. At is the Doric form for ϵi . It is sometimes used also in Epic poetry, but only when κi immediately follows.

2. The adverb $\tilde{a}\nu$ (Epic $\kappa \epsilon$ or $\kappa \epsilon \nu$, Doric κa) is regularly joined with ϵi in the *protasis*, when the verb is in the *Subjunctive* (§ 50, 1); ϵi with $\tilde{a}\nu$ (\tilde{a}) forming the compound $\epsilon a\nu$, $\tilde{a}\nu$ (\bar{a}), or $\tilde{\eta}\nu$. See § 38, 1.) The simple ϵi is used in the protasis with the Indicative and the Optative.

The same adverb $\tilde{a}\nu$ is regularly used in the apodosis with the Optative (§ 50, 2), and also with the secondary

tenses of the Indicative in the construction explained in § 49, 2. (See § 37, 3, and § 39.)

3. The negative particle of the protasis is regularly $\mu \dot{\eta}$, that of the apodosis is $o\dot{v}$.

Note. When the last rule is violated, and où is found in a protasis, it is always closely connected with a particular word (generally the verb), with which it forms a single negative expression; so that its negative force does not (like that of $\mu\dot{\eta}$) affect the protasis as a whole. E. g.

Πάντως δήπου (οὖτως ἔχει), ἐάν τε σὰ καὶ "Ανυτος οὰ φῆτε ἐάν τε φῆτε, if you deny it, as well as if you admit it. Plat. Apol. 25 B. (Here ἐὰν μὴ φῆτε would mean unless you admit it.) Εἰ μὲν οὰ πολλοὶ ἦσαν, καθ "καστον ᾶν περὶ τούτων ἦκούετε, if there were only a few, &c. Lys. Agorat. p. 135; § 62. Cf. p. 137; § 76. (Here οὰ πολλοὶ are used together in the sense of ὀλίγοι.) Τῶνδε μὲν οὐδείσον ἐστὶν, εἴγε ἀψ ἡμῶν γε τῶν ἐν μέσω οὐδεὶς οὐδέποτε ἄρξεται, there is no fairness in this, if (it is the plan, that) no one is ever to begin with us. Xen. Cyr. II, 2, 3.

The following example makes the difference between où and $\mu\dot{\eta}$ particularly clear, où affecting merely the verb, and $\mu\dot{\eta}$ affecting the whole (including the où): $\epsilon i \ \mu\dot{\eta}$ $\Pi\rho\delta\dot{\xi}\epsilon\nu\nu\nu$ où χ $\dot{\nu}\pi\epsilon\delta\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\xi}a\nu\tau\sigma$, $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\dot{\omega}\theta\eta\sigma a\nu$ $\ddot{a}\nu$, if it had not been that they did not receive Proxenus, they would have been saved. Dem. F. L. 364, 11.

When several clauses, introduced by $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ and $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$, depend upon a single $\hat{\epsilon} \hat{\epsilon}$ which precedes them all, $\hat{\epsilon} \hat{\nu}$ is used even more frequently than $\mu \hat{\eta}$; as such clauses have their own construction independently of the $\hat{\epsilon} \hat{\epsilon}$, which merely introduces each of them as a whole, not affecting the construction of particular words. E. g.

Δεινὸν ἃν εἶη, εὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκείνων ξύμμαχοι ἐπὶ δουλεία τῆ αὐτῶν φεροντες οὐκ ἀπεροῦσιν, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτοὶ σώζεσθαι οὐκ ἄρα δαπανήσομεν, it would be a hard thing, if (τὶ is a fact that) their allies will not refuse, &c., while we will not contribute. Thuc. I, 121. Εἰτ' οὐκ αἰσχρὸν, εἰ τὸ μὲν ᾿Αργείων πλῆθος οὐκ ἐφοβήθη τὴν Λακεδαιμονών ἀρχὴν, ὑμεῖς δὲ βάρβαρον φοβήσεσθε; is it not then disgraceful, if (τὶ is true, that) the Argive people did not fear, &c. Dem. Rhod. 197, 9.

Classification of Conditional Sentences.

§ 48. The supposition contained in a protasis may be either particular or general. A particular supposi-

tion refers to a definite act or a definite series of acts. A general supposition refers to any one of a class of acts, which may occur (or may have occurred) on any one of a series of possible occasions, — if having the force of if ever or whenever.

The following examples contain particular suppositions:

If he is (now) able to do this, he is doing it, εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύναται, ποιεῖ. If he was able to do this, he did it, εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἐδύνατο, ἐποίει. If he (shall) be able to do this, he will do it, ἐὰν τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύνηται, ποιήσει. If he should be able to do this, he would do it, εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύνατο, ποιοίη ἄν.

The following contain general suppositions: -

If he is (ever) able to do this, he (always) does it, ἐὰν τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύνηται, ποιεῖ. If any one (ever) wishes to go, it is (always) permitted, ἐάν τις βούληται ἰέναι, ἔξεστιν. If he was (ever) able to do this, he (always) did it, εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύναιτο, ἐποίει. If any one (ever) wished to go, it was (always) permitted, εἴ τις βούλοιτο ἰέναι, ἐξῆν. If any one shall (ever) wish to go, it will (always) be permitted, ἐάν τις ἰέναι βούληται, ἀεὶ ἐξέσται. If any one should (ever) wish to go, it would (always) be permitted, εἴ τις ἰέναι βούλοιτο, ἀεὶ ἄν ἐξείη.

Although this distinction can logically apply to all suppositions (present, past, and future), yet the Greek distinguishes the two classes in construction only in present and past conditions, even here excepting those which imply non-fulfilment of the condition. Therefore all the classes under I., except A. 1, include both particular and general suppositions.

- I. Excluding from A. 1 the past and present general suppositions, which have a peculiar construction, we have four forms of ordinary conditional sentences:—
- A. If the protasis refers to the present or the past, the question as to the fulfilment of the condition which it expresses has been already decided (in point of fact) either affirmatively or negatively; the speaker, however, either may or may not wish to imply by his form of statement how that question has been decided. He will, therefore, state such a condition in one of two ways:—

1. If he refers to a present or past condition, expressing no opinion as to its fulfilment, he may say if he is doing this, εἰ τοῦτο πράσσει,—if he was doing it. εἰ ἔπρασσεν,—if he did it, εἰ ἔπραξεν,—if he has done it, εἰ πέπραχεν,—if he had already done it, εἰ ἐπεπράχει. The apodosis, expressing the result of the fulfilment of such a condition, may refer to the present, the past, or the future. Thus we may say,

Εἰ πράσσει τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔχει, if he is doing this, it is well. Εἰ πράσσει τοῦτο, ἡμάρτηκεν, if he is doing this, he has err.d. Εἰ πράσσει τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔξει, if he is doing this, it will be well.

Ei ἔπραξε τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔχει (εἰχεν, ἔσχεν, οτ ἔξει), if he did this, it is (was or will be) well; and so with the other tenses in the protasis. (See § 49, 1.)

So in Latin, Si hoc facit, bene est; Si hoc fecit, bene erit.

2. If, on the other hand, he refers to a present or past condition, wishing to imply that it is not or was not fulfilled, he may say if he were now doing this, εἰ τοῦτο ἔπρασσεν; or if he had done this (although he did not do it), εἰ ἔπραξεν. The apodosis here denotes what would be or would have been the result, if the false supposition in the protasis were a valid one. The apodosis here contains the adverb ἄν, which distinguishes it from those forms of apodosis belonging under 1 in which past tenses are used. Thus we may say,

El ἔπρασσε τοῦτο, καλῶς αν είχεν, if he were (now) doing this, it would be well. El ἔπρασσε τοῦτο, καλῶς αν είχεν may also mean if he had been doing this, it would have been well.

Εἰ ἔπραξε τοῦτο, καλῶs ἃν ἔσχεν (or ἃν εἶχεν), if he had done this, it would have been well (or it would now be well). On the other hand, εἰ ἔπραξε τοῦτο, καλῶs ἔσχεν (without ἄν) would mean if he did this, it was well. (See § 49, 2.)

In Latin: Si hoc faceret, bene esset; Si hoc fecisset, bene fuisset.

- REMARK 1. The Greek has thus a special form (A, 2) implying that a condition is not or was not fulfilled, and another (A, 1) implying nothing whatever as to its fulfilment. There is no special form implying that the condition is or was fulfilled, a force often erroneously assigned to the form A, 1. If this is to be expressed at all, it must be done by the context, not by the form of the verb.
- B. If the protasis refers to the future, the question as to the fulfilment of the condition is, of course, at present undecided, and a speaker may state such a condition in either of two ways (B, 1 and 2), which differ more in the form of statement than in their meaning:—

1. He may say if he shall do this, ἐὰν πράσση τοῦτο (or, still more vividly, εἰ πράξει τοῦτο), making a distinct supposition of a future case. The natural apodosis to such a protasis expresses what will be the result, if the condition shall be fulfilled. We may therefore say,

'Εὰν πράσση τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔξει, if he do this, it will be well; or εἰ πράξει τοῦτο, καλῶς ἔξει, if he shall do this, it will be well. (See § 50, 1.) In Latin: Si hoc faciet (more frequently si hoc fecerit), bene erit; rarely si hoc faciat, bene erit.

2. He may also say, if he should do this, εὶ πράσσοι τοῦτο, still supposing a case in the future, but less distinctly and vividly than before. The natural apodosis to such a protasis is a similar indefinite expression, it would be. We can therefore say.

El πράσσοι τοῦτο, καλῶς ἄν ἔχοι, if he should do this, it would be well. (See § 50, 2.) In Latin: Si hoc faciat, bene sit.

- Remark 2. The two forms of protasis which the Greek expresses by the Subjunctive (ἐὰν πράσση τοῦτο) and the Optative (εἰ πράσσοι τοῦτο) have only one equivalent form in Latin; si hoc facial meaning if he shall do this (ἐὰν τοῦτο πράσση), as well as if he should do this (εἰ τοῦτο πράσσοι). (See § 50, 2, Rem. b) But in the former sense the Latin commonly employs the Future Indicative, si hoc faciet (corresponding to εἰ τοῦτο πράξει, if he shall do this), or the Future Perfect, si hoc fecerit, leaving the form si hoc faciat to represent the Greek εἰ τοῦτο πράσσοι, if he should do this.
- II. In general suppositions the two following classes are distinguished in construction from the corresponding particular suppositions (I. A, 1).
- A. First, when the apodosis contains a verb of present time, expressing a customary or repeated action or a general truth, and the protasis refers to indefinite time represented in English as present. We may then say,

Έαν τις τοῦτο πράσση, καλῶς ἔχει, if any one (ever) does this, it is (ir. all such cases) well. Έαν τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύνηται, ποιεῖ, if he is (ever) able to this, he (in all such cases) does it. Έαν τις τούτου πίη, ἀποθνήσκει, if any one (ever) drinks of this, he dies.

B. Secondly, when the apodosis expresses a customary or repeated action or a general truth in past time, and the protasis refers to indefinite past time. We may then say,

Εἴ τις τοῦτο πράσσοι, καλῶς εἶχεν, if any one (ever) did this, it was (in all such cases) well. Εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖν δύναιτο, ἐποίει, if he was (ever) able to do this, he (always) did it. Εἴ τις τούτου πίοι, ἀπέθνη σκεν, if any one (ever) drank of this, he died.

REMARK 1. General suppositions referring to the future (see p. 89), as well as those referring to the present or past with non-fulfilment of the condition implied, not being distinguished by their form from particular suppositions, are included under the rules of § 49, 2 and § 50, 1 and 2.

Remark 2. Although the Latin occasionally agrees with the Greek in the construction of general conditional sentences,—using si faciat and si faceret like $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{a}\nu$ $\pi\rho\dot{a}\sigma\sigma\eta$ and $\dot{\epsilon}i$ $\pi\rho\dot{a}\sigma\sigma\sigma$ above,—it commonly agrees with the English in not distinguishing this class from I, A, 1.

I. Four Forms of Ordinary Conditional Sentences.

A. Present and Past Conditions.

§ 49. 1. (Particular Suppositions.) When the protasis in a particular supposition simply states a present or a past condition, implying nothing as to the truth of the supposition, the verb is in one of the present or past tenses of the Indicative, after ϵi . Any tense of the Indicative may be used in the apodosis, to express the result of the fulfilment of the condition. E. g.

Εὶ ἐβρόντησε, καὶ ἤστραψεν, if it thundered, it also lightened. (This does not imply that the speaker has any knowledge or opinion on the question whether it actually thundered.) Εὶ δ' οὖτω τοῦτο ἐστὶν, ἐμοὶ μέλλει φίλον είναι. Il. I, 564. See I, 178. Εὶ τότε κοῦρος ἔα, νῦν αὖτέ με γῆρας ἀπάζει. Il. IV, 321. Εὶ θεοί τι δρῶσιν αἰσχρὸν, οὐκ εἰσὶν θεοί. Ευπ. Beller. Fr. 294. Εὶ ἐγὰ Φαῖδρον ἀγνοῶ, καὶ ἐμαυτοῦ ἐπιλέλησμαι ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐδέτερά ἐστι τοίτων, if I do not know Phaedrus, I have forgotten myself; but netither of these is the case. Plat. Phaedr. 228 A. (See § 48, I, A, Rem. 1.) Εὶ μὲν (᾿Ασκληπιὸς) θεοῦ ἦν, οὐκ ἦν αἰσχροκερδὴς, εὶ δ' αἰσχροκερδὴς, οὐκ ἦν θεοῦ. Plat. Rep. III, 408 C. Εὶ μηδὲν τούτων πεποίηκας, τὶ φοβήση;

NOTE 1. The Imperative, the Subjunctive in exhortations or prohibitions, or the Optative in wishes, may stand in the apodosis. E. g.

'Aλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ σοι, στεῖχε, if thou art resolved, go. SOPH. Ant. 98. (Here ἐὰν δοκῆ would refer to the future, while εἰ δοκεῖ is strictly present in its time. Cf. Antig. 76.) 'Αλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ, πλέωμεν, ὁρμάσθω ταχύς. SOPH. Phil. 526. 'Αλλ' εἴ που πτωχῶν γε θεοὶ καὶ ἐρινύες εἰσὶν, 'Αντίνοον πρὸ γάμοιο τέλος θανάτοιο κιχείγ. Od. XVII, 475. 'Αλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ στι ταῦθ', ὑπαί τις ἀρβύλας λύοι τάχος, but if this pleases you, let some one quickly loose the shoes, &c.

AESCH. Agam. 944. Káktor' ἀπολοίμην, Ξανθίαν εἰ μὴ Φιλῶ. ARIST. Ran. 579. In the last three examples the Optative expresses a wish (§ 82), and must not be confounded with the Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ in apodosis (§ 50, 2).

REMARK. A protasis of this class may also be followed by an apodosis in the Optative with $d\nu$, as $\epsilon l \tau o \hat{\nu} \tau' d\lambda \eta \theta \epsilon s \epsilon o \tau \iota \nu$, $\eta \delta \epsilon \omega s a \nu a \tau \epsilon \lambda \theta o \iota \mu \iota$, if this is true, I should be glad to depart. But such an apodosis always implies a protasis with an Optative, which is independent of the one expressed; so that these examples belong under the mixed constructions of § 54. See § 54, 1 (a).

- NOTE 2. Under this head belong all cases of particular suppositions referring to the present or the past in which the non-fulfilment of the condition is not implied. We must be careful not to include in this class the general suppositions explained in § 51; which require a Subjunctive or Optative in the protasis, although we commonly translate them in English by the simple Indicative.
- Note 3. The condition may still be present, even when the Future Indicative stands in the protasis, if that tense expresses merely a present intention or necessity that something shall happen hereafter; as when ϵl $\tau o \hat{\nu} \tau o \tau o i \hat{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ means if he is (now) about to do this, and not (as it does in an ordinary future condition) if he shall do this. E. g.

Αἷρε πλῆκτρον, εἰ μαχεῖ, raise your spur, if you are going to fight. ARIST. Av. 761. (Εἰ μαχεῖ in protasis commonly means if you shall fight, being equivalent to ἐὰν μάχη.) Οἱ εἰς τὴν βασιλικὴν τέχνην παιδενόμενοι · · · τἱ διαφέρουσι τῶν ἐξ ἀνάγκης κακοπαθούντων, εἰ σουσι καὶ διψήσουσι καὶ ὁ ινώσουσι καὶ ἀντων μοχθήσουσι καὶ ὁ ινώσουσι καὶ ἀνηντων ἡσουσι καὶ τἄλλα πάντα μοχθήσουσιν ἐκόντες; how do they differ, &c., if they are to suffer hunger, thirst, &c. (i. e. if it is necessary that they should suffer)? ΧΕΝ. Μεπ. ΙΙ, 17. ³Η νῦν ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἀνὴρ, αὐτη δ' ἀνὴρ, εἰ ταῦτ' ἀνατεὶ τῆδε κείσεται κράτη, if this is to pass unpunished. Soph. Ant. 484. So εἰ πόλεμος δαμᾶ, IΙ, I, 61; and εἰ διαβληθήσομαι, Eur. Hec. 863.

2. In sentences containing present or past conditions, when it is implied that the condition of the protasis is not or was not fulfilled, and when the apodosis expresses

what would be (or would have been) the result if that condition were (or had been) fulfilled, the secondary tenses of the *Indicative* are used in both protasis and apodosis. The apodosis regularly contains the adverb äv.

The Imperfect here refers to present time or to a continued or repeated action in past time, the Aorist to an action simply occurring in past time, and the (rare) Pluperfect to an action completed in past or present time. E. g.

El $\tau \circ \tilde{\tau} \tau \rho \alpha \sigma \sigma \epsilon$, kalûs åv $\epsilon l \chi \epsilon \nu$, if he were (now) doing this, it would be well (implying that he is not doing it). This may also mean if he had been doing this, it would have been well (implying that he was not doing it). The context must decide, in each case, to which time the Imperfect refers. El $\tau \circ \tilde{\tau} \tau \rho \alpha \xi \epsilon$, kalûs åv $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \epsilon \nu$, if he had done this, it would have been well (implying that he did not do it.) El $\tau \circ \tilde{\tau} \tau \rho \alpha \chi \epsilon \iota$, kalûs åv $\tilde{\epsilon} \iota \chi \epsilon \nu$, if he had finished doing this (now, or at any past time), it would be well (implying either he has not, or he had not finished it).

Ταῦτα οὐκ ἂν ἐδύναντο ποιεῖν, εἰ μὴ καὶ διαίτη μετρία ἐχρῶντο, they would not be able to do this, if they did not lead an abstenious life. XEN. Cyr. I, 2, 16. Πολὺ ἂν θαυμαστότερον ἢν, εἰ ἐτιμῶντο, it would be much more wonderful, if they were honored. Plat. Rep. VI, 489 B. Οὐχ οὕτω δ' ἄν προθύμως ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον ὑμᾶς πα ρεκά λουν, εἰ μὴ τὴν εἰρὴνην ἐώρ ων αἰσχρὰν ἐσομένην, I should not exhort you, did I not see (as I do), &c. Isoc. Archid. p. 134 A. § 87. Λέγουσι πάντα ἢ ἔχει· καὶ τοι εἰ μὴ ἐτύ χχανεν αὐτοῖς ἐπιστήμη ἐνοῦσα, οὐκ ἄν οδοί τ' ἢ σαν τοῦτο ποιήσειν, they tell everything as it is: and yet if knowledge did not chance to be in them, they could not do this. Plat. Phaed. 73 A. Εὖ ἴσθ' ὅτι εἴ τι ἐμοῦ ἐκ ἡ δου, οὐδενὸς ᾶν οῦτω με ἀποστερεῖν ἐφυλάττου ὡς ἀξιώματος καὶ τιμῆς, if you cared for me at all, you would take care, &c. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. V, 5, 34. Εὶ μὴ ἄπληστός τε ἔας χρημάτων καὶ αἰσχροκερδὴς, οὐκ ᾶν νεκρῶν θήκας ἀνέφγες. HDT. I, 187. (This implies ἄπληστος εἶ, thou art insatiable, and ἀνέφγες, thou didst open.)

Οὐκ ἂν νήσων ἐκράτει, εἰ μή τι καὶ ναυτικὸν εἶχεν, he would not have been master of the islands, if he had not had also some naval force (implying ναυτικὸν εἶχεν and νήσων ἐκράτει, he had a navy, and he was master of the islands). Thuc. I, 9. (Ταῦτα) οὐκ ἂν προ έλεγεν, εἰ μὴ ἐπίστενεν ἀληθεύσειν, he would not have declared these things (referring to several), had he not been confident that he should speak the truth. Xen. Mem. I, 1, 5. Εἶ ἢσαν ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ, ὡς σὰ φὴς, οὐκ ἄν ποτε ταῦτα ἔπασχον, if they had been good men, as you say, they would never have suffered these things (referring to several cases). Plat. Gorg. 516 E.

Καί νύ κ' ἔτι πλέονας Λυκίων κτάνε δῖος 'Οδυσσεὺς, εἰ μὴ ἄρ' δξὸ νόη σε μέγας κορυθαίολος Έκτωρ, i. e. Ulysses would have killed still more, had not Hector perceived him. II. V. 679. Καί νύ κεν ἤια πάντα κατέφθιτο καὶ μένε ἀνδρῶν, εἰ μή τίς με θεῶν ὀλοφύρατο καί μ' ἐσάωσεν. Od. IV, 363. Καὶ ἴσως ᾶν διὰ ταῦτ' ἀπέθανον, εἰ μὴ ἀρχὴ διὰ ταχέων κατελύθη. PLAT. Apol. 32 D. Τί ποτ ἄν ἕπαθον ὑπ' αὐτῶν, εἰ πλείω χρόνον ἐπετροπεύθην; εἰ κατελείφθην μὲν ἐνιαύσιος, ἔξ ἔτη δὲ προσεπετροπεύθην ὑπ' αὐτῶν, οὐδ ἄν τὰ μικρὰ ταῦτα παρ' αὐτῶν ἀπέλαβον. DEM. Aph. I, 833, 12-19. Εἰ τοίνυν ὁ Φίλιππος τότε ταύτην ἔσχε τὴν γνώμην, οὐδὲν ἄν δυν νυνὶ πεποίηκεν ἔπραξεν, οὐδὲ τοσαύτην ἐκτήσατο δύναμιν. DEM. Phil. I, 41, 18. (See below, Remark b; and § 42, 4.)

Εὶ μὴ ὑμεῖς ἤλθετε, ἐπορευόμεθα ἄν ἐπὶ βασιλέα, if you had not come, we should (now) be on our way to the King. (Aor. and Imperf.) ΧΕΝ. Απ. Π, 1, 4. Εἰ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ παρεληλυθότος χρόνου τὰ δέοντα οὖτοι συνεβούλευσαν, οὐδὲν ἂν ὑμᾶς υῦν ἔδει βουλεύεσθαι, if they had given the necessary advice in time past, there would now be no need of your deliberating. DΕΜ. Phil. I, 40, 9. Τοῦτο εἰ ἀπεκρίνω, iκανῶς ἄν ἤδη παρὰ σοῦ τὴν ὁσιότητα ἐμεμαθήκη, if you had answered this, I should have already learned, &c. (implying ἀλλ' οὐ μεμάθηκα, but now I have not learned). PLAT. Euthyph. 14 C. Λοιπὸν δ' ἀν ἦν ἡμῖν ἔτι περὶ τῆς πόλεως διαλεχθῆναι τῆς ἡμετέρας, εἰ μὴ προτέρα τῶν ἄλλων τὴν εἰρήνην ἐπεποίητο. (This implies ἀλλὰ τὴν εἰρήνην προτέρα πεποίηται.) Isoc. Phil. p. 93 C. § 56. Τῶν ἀδικημάτων ἂν ἐμεμνητο τῶν αὐτοῦ, εἴ τι περὶ ἐμοῦ γ' ἔγραφεν. DΕΜ. Cor. 251, 28.

Different tenses can of course be used in the protasis and apodosis, if the sense requires it. See especially the example quoted above

from Dem. Phil. I, p. 40, 9, and the preceding one.

This construction is the exact equivalent of the Latin Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive in protasis and apodosis. With regard to the tenses, the Latin Imperfect Subjunctive represents the Greek Imperfect Indicative referring to present time; while the Latin Pluperfect Subjunctive represents the Greek Aorist and Pluperfect Indicative, and also the Imperfect referring to past time.

REMARK. (a.) It will be seen by the examples, that this construction usually implies, not merely that the condition of the protasis is not (or was not) fulfilled, but also that the action of the apodosis does not (or did not) take place: thus, el τοῦτο ἔπραξεν, ἐσώθη ἄν, if he had done this, he would have been saved, implies not merely that he did not do this, but also that he was not saved. The denial of the apodosis is not, however, inferred as a necessary consequence from the denial of the protasis, which would often be an illogical inference; for (in the example above) the person might have been saved in some

other way, even if he did not do the thing referred to. Indeed, where it is not implied that the action of the apodosis depends as a result upon that of the protasis as its condition, the action of the apodosis is not denied: this happens when the protasis expresses a concession, introduced by kal el, even if, although, or où el, not even if; as kal el τούτο ἔπραξεν, ἐσώθη ἄν, even if he had done this, he would have been saved, where it may be implied that he was saved.

(b.) In this form of conditional sentence, therefore, the verb of the protasis always (and the verb of the apodosis generally) implies its opposite; the Imperfect always implying a Present or Imperfect, the Aorist an Aorist, and the Pluperfect usually a Perfect or Pluperfect. Thus εἰ ἔπρασσε, when it means if he were doing, implies ἀλλ' οὐ πράσσει, but really he is not doing; when it means if he had been doing, it implies ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔπρασσε, but really he was not doing: εἰ μὴ ἔπραξεν, if he had not done, implies ἀλλ' ἔπραξεν, but really he did do: εἰ ἐπεποιήκει τοῦτο, if he had already done this, implies either ἀλλ' οὐ πεποίηκει, but really he has not done it, or ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπεποιήκει, but really he had not done it, according to the context. This principle will show which tense of the Indicative is to be used in any given case, in writing Greek.

The Aorist, however, is very often used here, as elsewhere, where the Pluperfect would express the time intended more exactly (§ 19, N. 4); as in the sentence above quoted, οὐδὲν ἄν ωννὶ πεποίηκεν ἔπραξεν, where the Perfect πεποίηκεν shows that the Pluperfect might have been used for ἔπραξεν.

NOTE 1. In Homer, the Imperfect in this construction refers to past time, and is to be translated by our Pluperfect. E. g.

Ένθα κε λοιγὸς ἔην καὶ ἀμήχανα ἔργα γένοντο, εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, then there would have been, &c. Π. VIII, 130. Εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ τάδε ἤδε' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πευκαλίμησιν, οὐκ ὰν ὑπεξέφυγε Στυγὸς ὕδατος αἰπὰ ῥέεθρα, if I had known, &c. Id. 366.

Note 2. Sometimes $d\nu$ is omitted in the apodosis, although the non-fulfilment of the condition is still implied. This merely gives a more emphatic expression, as when we say it had been for it would have been. The $d\nu$ can be omitted only when the

context shows conclusively that the construction is not that of § 49, 1. E. g.

Naì μὰ Δία ἢ σχυνό μην μέντοι, εἰ ὑπὸ πολεμίου γε ὅντος ἐξηπατήθην, yes, by Zeus, I were indeed ashamed, if I had been deceived, &c. Xen. An. VII, 6, 21. Καλὸν ἢν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος, it had been good for that man, if he had not been born. MATTH. Evang. XXVI, 24.

Compare Verg. Aen. XI, 115: Aequius huic Turnum fuerat se opponere morti, it had been more just, &c., where fuisset would have been the regular form.

Note 3. (a.) An apodosis without αν, but implying the non-fulfilment of a condition, is often formed by an Infinitive depending on the Imperfect of a verb denoting necessity, obligation, propriety, possibility, or the like. This combination merely expresses in other words what might have been expressed by the verb of the Infinitive in a past tense of the Indicative with αν. Thus ἔδει σε τοῦτον φιλεῦν means you ought to love him (or ought to have loved him),—implying, but you do not love him (or did not love him),—and is equivalent to τοῦτον αν ἐφίλεις, εἰ τὰ δέοντα ἐποίεις, you would love him (or would have loved him), if you did (or had done) what you ought. So εἰκὸς ἦν σε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι means you would properly have done this (but you did not), being equivalent to εἰκότως τοῦτ αν ἐποίησας.

This construction occurs chiefly after the impersonal Imperfects $\chi\rho\hat{\eta}\nu$ or $\dot{\epsilon}\chi\rho\hat{\eta}\nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota$, $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\hat{\eta}\nu$, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\hat{\eta}\nu$, $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\hat{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\nu$, $\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}k\dot{\alpha}\dot{\alpha}\hat{\eta}\nu$, $\tilde{\eta}\rho\mu\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu$ (decebat), $\tilde{\eta}\nu$ or $i\pi\hat{\eta}\rho\chi\epsilon\nu$ (it was possible), and $\tilde{\eta}\nu$ with nouns and adjectives expressing necessity, propriety, &c. So when $\tilde{\eta}\nu$ is used with the verbal in $-\tau\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\nu$ (equivalent to $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota$ with the Infinitive). When the Present Infinitive is used, the construction refers to present time or to continued or repeated action in past time; when the Aorist Infinitive is used, it refers to a single or momentary action in past time. E. g.

El ἐπ' ἡμέας μούνους ἐστρατηλάτεε ὁ Πέρσης, χρῆν αὐτὸν πάντων τῶν ἄλλων ἀπεχόμενον οὖτω ἰ έναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡμετέρην καὶ ἄν ἐδήλου τᾶσι ὡς ἐπὶ Σκύθας ἐλαύνει, if the Persian were making his expedition against us alone, he ought, letting alone all others, to be marching directly into our country; and then he would show that he was marching against Scythians. Hot. IV, 118. Here χρῆν ἰέναι means he would be marching into our country (like ἤιεν ἄν), if he were doing what would be expected under such circumstances,— implying that this

condition is not fulfilled. (See below, Rem. 1.) Έχρ η ν μέν οὖν καὶ δίκαιον ην τους τον στέφανον οιομένους δείν λαβείν αὐτους άξίους έπιδεικνύναι τούτου, μη έμε κακώς λέγειν έπειδη δε τούτο παρέντες εκείνο ποιούσιν; κ.τ.λ., i. e. those who think they ought to receive the crown would (if they did what is right and just) be showing that they deserve it themselves, and not be abusing me; but since now they have neglected the former and do the latter, &c. DEM. Cor. Trier. 1228, 28. Εἰ γὰρ ὑπ' ὀδόντος τοι είπε τελευτήσειν με, χρην δή σε ποιέειν τὰ ποιέεις νῦν δὲ ὑπ' αἰχμης, if he had said that I was to be killed by a tooth, then you would have to do as you now do. Hot. I, 39. (See helow, Rem. 1.) "Εδει μέν τους λέγοντας απαντας μήτε προς έχθραν ποιείσθαι λόγων μηδένα μήτε πρὸς χάριν, i. e. the speakers ought not to say a word out of regard either to enmity or to favor (and yet thez do so). Dem. Chers. 90, 1. Πότερον αὐτην έχρην έν τη Θετταλών καὶ Δολόπων τάξει συγκατακτᾶσθαι Φιλίππω την τῶν Ἑλλήνων άρχήν; i. e. ought she to have helped Philip acquire his dominion over the Greeks (so. as she would have done by your policy)? DEM. Cor. 246, 1. Ἐμὲ εἰ μὲν ἐν ἄλλαις τισὶν ἡμέραις ἡδίκησέ τι τούτων ἰδιώτην όντα, ίδια καὶ δίκην προσήκεν αὐτώ διδόναι, i. e. he would properly have given satisfaction by a private suit (as if he had said προσηκόντως ίδια δίκην αν εδίδου). ĎΕΜ. Mid. 525, 3. Καὶ πολλοῖς δόξω, ώς ο los τ' ων σε σωζειν εί ήθελον αναλίσκειν χρήματα, αμελήσαι, i. c. whereas I might have saved you, if I had been willing to spend money, &c. Plat. Crit. 44 C. Οὐ γὰρ ἐνῆν μὴ παρακρουσθέντων ὑμῶν μεῖναι Φιλίππω, for Philip could not have remained, unless you had been deceived (implying he did remain). DEM. F. L. 379, 2. (See § 52, 1.) Καὶ μάλιστα εἰκὸς ἦν ὑμᾶς προορᾶσθαι αὐτὰ καὶ μὴ μαλακῶς, ὅσπερ νῦν, ξυμμαχεῖν. ΤΗυς. VI, 78. (The orator adds, ἀλλ ούθ' ύμεις νῦν νέ πω ούθ' οι ἄλλοι ἐπὶ ταῦτα ώρμησθε.) Εὶ μὲν τοίνυν αλσχρόν τι έμελλον εργάσεσθαι, θάνατον άντ' αὐτοῦ προαιρετέον ήν (i. e. προαιρείσθαι έδει). XEN. Mem. II, 7, 10. So in Latin: Quem patris loco, si ulla in te pietas esset, colere debebas. Cic. Phil. II. 38.

- (b.) The Aorist and Imperfect of δφείλω (δφέλλω) are sometimes used with the Infinitive like χρῆν, ἔδει, &c.; as in II. I, 353, τιμήν πέρ μοι ὄφελλεν 'Ολύμπιος ἐγγναλίξαι Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης · νῦν δ' οὐδέ με τυτθὸν ἔτισεν, i. e. Zeus ought to have secured me honor; but now he has not honored me even a little. From this comes the common use of this form in expressions of a wish; as ὥφελε Κῦρος ζῆν, would that Cyrus were living (lit. Cyrus ought to be living). This is an apodosis, implying as a protasis if it were possible, or something similar. See § 83, 2.
- (c.) Similar to this is the occasional use of $\epsilon \beta o \nu \lambda \delta \mu \eta \nu$ (without $\tilde{a}\nu$) to express what some one wishes were now true (but which is not true). E. g.

Έβουλόμην μέν οὖν καὶ τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὰς έκκλησίας ὀμθώς

διοικεῖσθαι καὶ τοὺς νόμους ἰσχύειν, would that both the Senate and t.e assemblies were rightly managed, and that the laws were in force (implying the opposite of ὀρθῶς διοικεῖσθαι and ἰσχύειν). This is analogous to ἄφελεν εἶναι, would that it were, and ἔδει εἶναι, it ought to be (but is not). AESCHIN. Cor. § 2. Ἐβουλόμην μὲν οὖκ ἐρίζειν ἐνθάδε, would that I were not contending here (as I am). ARIST. Ran. 866. See below, Rem. 2.

(d.) Kinduneion is used with the Infinitive, as a periphrasis for the verb of the Infinitive with $\tilde{a}\nu$. E. g.

Ή πόλις ἐκινδύνευσε πᾶσα διαφθαρηναι, εἰ ἄνεμος ἐπεγενετο, the city was in danger of being utterly destroyed, if a wind had arisen. Thuc. III, 74. Εἰ μὴ ἐξεφύγομεν εἰς Δελφοὺς, ἐκινδυνεύσαμεν ἀπολέσθαι, if we had not escaped to Delphi, we were in danger of perishing (or there was danger that we should perish) Aeschin. Cor. § 123. (If the meaning had been that there would have been danger, we should have had ἐκινδυνεύσαμεν ἄν.)

(e.) The Imperfect of $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$ with the Infinitive may express a past intention or expectation which was not realized, and so take the place of the verb of the Infinitive with $\tilde{a}\nu$. E. g.

"Η μάλα δὴ 'Αγαμέμνονος φθίσεσθαι κακὸν οἶτον ἔμελλον, εἰ μὴ... ἔειπες, i. e. I should have perished like A. (lit. I was to have perished), if thou hadst not spoken. Od. XIII, 383. Μέλλεν μέν ποτε οἶκος ὅδ' ἀφνειὸς καὶ ἀμύμων ἔμμεναι·νὺν δ' ἐτέρως ἐβόλοντο θεοί. Od. I, 232. Οὐ συστρατεύσειν ἔμελλον, they would not have joined him (in that case). Dem. F. L. 391, 11. So in Latin: Hoc facturi erant, nisi venisset, they were to have done this, had he not come.

So ἔφην in Od. IV, 171: καί μιν ἔφην ἐλθόντα φιλήσεμεν ἔξοχον ἄλλων, εἰ νῶιν νόστον ἔδωκεν (Zεύs), i. e. I intended to love him (and should have done so) had Zeus granted us a return.

Remark 1. It will be seen that in the construction of Note 3 a protasis is implied with the apodosis; $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon_l$ $\sigma\epsilon$ $\tau o\tilde{\nu}\tau v \phi_l\lambda\tilde{\eta}\sigma a_l$ being strictly equivalent to $\tau o\tilde{\nu}\tau v v \tilde{\alpha}\nu$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\phi l\lambda\eta\sigma as$ $\tilde{\epsilon}l$ $\tau \tilde{a}$ $\delta \epsilon o\nu\tau a$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau o l\eta\sigma as$, you would have loved him. (See § 52, 1.) This form therefore commonly stands as an apodosis with no other protasis expressed; and even if another is added (as in the first example under a), the implied protasis always remains the prominent one. Especially, this implied protasis expresses the condition, the non-fulfilment of which prevents the action of the apodosis from taking place. The whole expression $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\nu$ $\tau o\tilde{\nu}\tau o$ $\pi o\iota\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$, &c. thus becomes the apodosis to the expressed protasis, if one is added. In the third example under a (HDT. I, 39), the real apodosis may be you would then do from necessity what you now do (implying that now you do not do it from necessity); or we may perhaps explain $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\nu$ better by Note 2.

In this construction the Infinitive (of course modified by the leading yerb, as shown above) contains the main idea of the apodosis.

When the main idea is contained in the verb of necessity, &c., so that the non-fulfilment of the condition of the protasis affects this rather than the infinitive, we have χρην ἄν, ἔδει ἄν, προσήκεν ἄν, &c., forming an ordinary apodosis (§ 49, 2). Thus εἰ τὰ δέοντα οὐτοι συνεβούλευσαν, οὐδεν αν ύμας νῦν ἔδει βουλεύεσθαι, if these men haa given the necessary advice, there would now be no need of your deliber. ating, implies but now there is need of your deliberating. Occasionally both constructions can be used to express essentially the same apodosis: thus in Lys. in Erat. § 32, we find, χρην δέ σε, είπερ ήσθα χρηστός, τοις μέλλουσιν άδίκως αποθανείσθαι μηνυτήν γενέσθαι, if you had been an honest man, you ought to have become an informer in behalf of those who were about to suffer death unjustly (implying but you did not do so, οὐκ ἐγένου μηνυτής); but in § 48, referring to the same thing, the orator says, είπερ ην ανήρ αγαθός, έχρην αν πρώτον μεν μή παρανόμως άρχειν, έπειτα τη βουλή μηνυτήν γενέσθαι, κ.τ.λ., if he had been a good man, it would have been his duty, &c. (implying The latter construction, however, is very rare where the former would be admissible.

The distinction between ἔδει σε τοῦτον φιλεῖν and ἔδει ἄν σε τοῦτον φιλεῖν would be expressed in Latin by te oportebat hunc amare and

te oporteret hunc amare.

REMARK 2. The greatest difficulty in understanding the forms explained in Note 3 is caused by the defect in the English verb ought, which makes it impossible to translate them accurately. Thus we translate οὐκ ἔδει σε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι (οτ ποιεῖν), non oportuit te hoc facere, you ought not to have done this, expressing the past time by the tense of the Infinitive, which we should express by the past tense of ought if there were one. (You oughted not to do this would represent the Greek and Latin idiom. The vulgar expression you had n't ought comes very near it.)

A further trouble appears when such phrases as οὐκ ἔδει σε τοῦτο ποιεῖν refer to present time, meaning you ought not to be doing this (as you are). The Imperfect here refers to present time, as it does in the ordinary construction of § 49, 2. The Latin has the same idiom, non oportebat te hoc facere. But in English, owing to the defect in the verb ought, we are obliged to use the simple present; so that we cannot distinguish in translation between ἔδει σε φιλεῖν, oportebat te amare, and δεῖ σε φιλεῖν, oportet te amare, — both being expressed by you ought to love, although the former implies but

you do not love, while the latter implies no condition.

It needs perhaps to be added, that the tenses of the infinitive here express no time of themselves, but are used in the ordinary constructions of § 15, 1, and § 23, 1. The equivalent Latin forms (facere representing both $\pi o\iota \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ and $\pi o\iota \hat{\eta} \sigma a\iota$) will make this clear.

REMARK 3. It must not be understood that the Imperfects ἐχρῆν ἔδει, &c. with the Infinitive are always used in the construction of Note 3. Thus ἔδει δὲ μένειν, in DEM. F. L. 379, 14, means simply but he was obliged to remain (and did remain).

Note 4. (a.) In Il. XXIII, 526 κ_{ℓ} is use i with a secondary tense of the Indicative in protasis, apparently adding nothing to the sense. (See § 50, 2. N. 2, b.)

Εὶ δέ κ' ἔτι πριτέρω γ έν ετ ο δρόμος ἀμφοτέροισιν, Τῷ κέν μιν παρέλασσ' οὐδ' ἀμφήριστον ἔθηκεν.

(b.) When $\tilde{a}\nu$ stands in the protasis with a secondary tense of the Indicative in Attic Greek, the expression is so obviously an apodosis at the same time, as to present no difficulty. "A ν can never coalesce with ϵi to form $\epsilon \acute{a}\nu$ in these sentences, as it always belongs to the verb. E. g.

Εἰ τοίνυν τοῦτο ἰσχυρὸν ἢν ἃν τούτᾳ τεκμήριον, κὰμοὶ γενέσθω τεκμήριον, κ.τ.λ., if then this would have been a strong proof for him (sc. had he had it to bring forward), so let it be also a proof for me, &c. Dem. Timoth. 1201, 19. (This sentence properly belongs to the class of 49, 1; for the protasis really is if it is true that this would have been a proof, to which the apodosis in the Imperative corresponds.) In Dem. Cor. 260, 2, καὶ τίς οὖκ ἃν ἀπέκτεινέ με δικαίως, εἶ τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων τἢ πόλει καλῶν λόγω μόνον καταισχύνειν ἐπεχείρησ' ἄν;— if we retain the final ἄν (which is strongly supported by Mss. authority), we must translate εἰ ἐπεχείρησ' ἄν if it is true that I would (under any circumstances) have undertaken, &c., and not simply if I had undertaken (εἰ ἐπεχείρησα). See § 50, 2, Note 2, a; and § 63, 2.

Note 5. In some cases the Aorist is found in the apodosis referring to present time, after a protasis in the Imperfect; it always denotes, however, a momentary or sudden occurrence, or some other idea which the Imperfect would not express so well. E. g.

El μèν οὖν σύ με ἡρώτας τι τῶν νῦν δὴ, εἶπον ἄν, κ.τ.λ., if then you were asking me any one of the questions before us, I should (at once) say, &c. Plat. Euthyph. 12 D. Εἰ ἐπεθύμεις ταύτης (τὴς σοφίας), καὶ ἐγώ σε ἐτύγχανον ἀνερωτῶν, κ.τ.λ., τί ἄν μοι ἀπεκρίνω; if you desired this kind of wisdom, and I happened to be asking you, &c., what should you reply? [Plat.] Theag. 123 B. See also Plat. Prot. 318 A; Gorg. 447 D; Symp. 199 D.

Note 6. (a.) In a very few passages in Homer we find the Optative with $\kappa \epsilon$ in the apodosis referring to the past, where we should expect a secondary tense of the Indicative. E. g.

Καί νύ κεν ἐνθ' ἀπόλοιτο ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας, εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ ᾿Αφροδίτη, Aeneas would have perished, had not Aphrodite quickly perceived him. II. V, 311. Καί νύ κεν ἐνθ' ἀπόλοιτο Ἅρης ἀτος πολέμοιο, εἰ μὴ Ἡεριβοία Ἑρμέᾳ ἐξήγγειλεν. II. V, 388. [In both these cases ἀπώλετο would be the regular form, in Homeric as well as in Attic Greek.) So II. XVII, 70, ἕνθα κε φ έροι is used for ἔνθα κ ἔφερεν, he would have carried. So II. V, 85, Τυδείδην δ' οὐκ ᾶν γνοίης ποτέροισι μετείη, you would not have known to which army he belonged: for the dependent Optative, see § 34, 3, Note.

(b.) The Imperfect Indicative is not used in Homer in the construction of § 49, 2 referring to present time. (See Note 1.) In a few cases where the Attic Greek would use that form, we find the present Optative in Homer. E. g.

Εἶ μέν τις τὸν ὄνειρον 'Αχαιῶν ἄλλος ἔνισπε, ψεῦδός κεν φαῖμεν, καὶ νοσφιζοίμεθα μᾶλλον, i. e. if any other one had told it, we should call it a falsehood, and should rather turn away from it. Π. Π. 80. In Π. ΧΧΙΠ, 274, we find the Optative in both protasis and apodosis, where the Attic Greek would use the Imperfect Indicative: εἰ νῦν ἐπὶ ἄλλφ ἀθλεύοιμεν, ἢ τ' ἀν ἐγὼ τὰ πρῶτα λαβὼν κλισίηνδε φεροίμην, i. e. if we were now contending in honor of another (than Patroclus), I should take the first prize and bear it to my tent. The present Optative in Homer is used also in its regular sense, referring to the Future (See § 50, 2.) The constructions included in this note seem to be a relic of an ancient use of the Optative in conditional sentences like that of the secondary tenses of the Latin Subjunctive. (See Appendix I.) For the similar Homeric use of the Present Optative in expressions of a wish, see § 82, Rem. 2.

B. Future Conditions.

§ 50. 1. When a supposed future case is stated distinctly and vividly (as in English, if I shall go), the protasis takes the Subjunctive with $\epsilon \acute{a}\nu$, $\check{a}\nu$ (\bar{a}), or $\check{\eta}\nu$ (Epic $\epsilon \acute{l}$ $\kappa \epsilon$ or $a \acute{l}$ $\kappa \epsilon$).

The apodosis denotes what will be the result, if the condition of the Protasis shall be fulfilled. It therefore takes the Future Indicative, or some other future form, like the Imperative. E. g.

"Έάν τι λάβω, δώσω σοι, if I (shall) receive anything, I will give it to you. 'Εάν τι λάβης, δός μοι, if you receive anything, give it to me. Εὶ δέ κεν δε ἔρ ξης καί τοι πείθωνται 'Αχαιοὶ, γνώση ἔπειθ' ὅς θ' ἡγεμόνων κακὸς ὅς τὰ νν λαῶν, but if you shall do thus and the Achaeans obey you, you will then learn both which of the leaders and which of the soldiers is bad. II. II, 364. (For εἴ κε see § 47, 2.) Αἴ κ' αὐτὸν γνώω νημερτέα πάντ' ἐνέποντα, ἔσσω μιν χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε, εἴματα αλά. Od. XVII, 549. So αἴ κε δῶσι, II. I, 128. (See § 47, 1, Note.) Εἰ μέν κεν Μενέλαον 'Αλέξανδρος καταπέψνη, αὐτὸς ἔπειθ' Ἑλένην ἐχ έτω καὶ κτήματα πάντα, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν νήεσσι νεώ μεθα ποντοπόροισιν εἰ δέ κ' 'Αλέξανδρον κτείνη ξανθὸς Μενέλαος, Τρῶας ἔπειθ' Ἑλένην καὶ κτήματα πάντ' ἀποδοῦναι. II. III, 281. Here ἐχέτω, νεώμεθα (Subj. in exhortation), and ἀποδοῦναι (Infin. for Imperative) are in the apodosis. Αἴ κα τῆνος ἕλη κεραὸν τράγον, αἶγα τὰ λαψŷ. ΤΗΕΟΟ. I, 4. *Αν δέ τις ἀνθιστῆται, σὶν ὑμῦν πειρα-

σόμεθα χειρούσθαι, if any one shall stand opposed to us, we will try to overcome him. Xen. An. VII, 3, 11. *Αν μὴ νῦν ἐθέλωμεν ἐκεῖ πολεμείν αὐτώ, ενθάδ' ἴσως ἀναγκασθησόμεθα τοῦτο ποιείν, if we shall not now be willing to fight him there, we shall perhaps be forced to do so here. Dem. Phil. I, 54, 20. Here νῦν refers to time immediately following the present: if Dem. had meant if we are not now willing, he would have said εἰ μὴ νῦν ἐθέλομεν (§ 49, 1). *Ην γὰρ ταῦτα καλῶς ὁρισώμεθα, ἄμεινου βουλευσόμεθα καὶ περὶ τῶν άλλων. Isoc. Pac. p. 162 D. § 18. *Ην δέ την είρηνην ποιησώμεθα, καὶ τοιούτους ήμας αὐτούς παράσχωμεν, μετά πολλης ἀσφαλείας την πόλιν οἰκή σομεν. Ib. p. 163 A. § 20. 'Εὰν οὖν ἵης νῦν, πότε ἔσει οικοι; ΧΕΝ. Cyr. V, 3, 27. Καὶ χρῶ αὐτοῖς, ἐὰν δέῃ τι, and use them, if there shall be any need. Ib. V, 4, 30. *Ην μὲν πόλεμον αιρησθε, μηκέτι ήκετε δεύρο ἄνευ ὅπλων, εἰ σωφρονείτε ἡν δὲ είρηνης δοκήτε δείσθαι, άνευ δπλων ήκετε ώς δε καλώς έξει τα υμέτερα, ην φίλοι γένησθε, έμοι μελήσει. lb. III, 2, 13. Έαν γάρ τί σε Φαν ω κακόν πεποιηκώς, όμολογ ω άδικειν' έαν μέντοι μηδέν Φαίνωμαι κακόν πεποιηκώς μηδέ βουληθείς, οὐ καὶ σὺ αὖ όμολογήσεις μηδέν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ ἀδικεῖσθαι; Ib V, 5, 13. (Here ὁμολογῶ must be understood as referring to the future, like ὁμολογήσεις. § 10, 1, Ν. 7.) Έαν μη η οί φιλόσοφοι βασιλεύσωσιν η οί βασιλης φιλοσοφήσωσιν, οὐκ ἔστι κακῶν παῦλα ταῖς πόλεσιν, unless either the philosophers shall become kings or the kings philosophers, there is no escape from troubles for states. Plat. Rep. V, 473 D. Δίδωσ' έκὼν κτείνειν έαυτὸν, ἢν τάδε ψευσθη λέγων. Soph. Phil. 1342. Ἐὰν μη ημίν βεβοηθηκότες ώσιν, οὐ δεί ημας αὐτοίς βοηθείν, if they shall not have assisted us, there is no need of our assisting them. σε τοῦ λοιποῦ ποτ' ἀφέλωμαι χρόνου, κάκιστ' ἀπολοίμην, i. e. may I perish, if I ever take them away. ARIST. Ran. 586. (See §34,1.)

Remark 1. It will be seen that the apodosis in this construction may take any form of the verb that refers to the future,—the Future Indicative, the Imperative, the Subjunctive in exhortations and prohibitions, the Infinitive in any future sense, or the Optative in wishes. It may also contain a Present Indicative including a reference to the future (like $\chi\rho\dot{\eta}$ or $\delta\epsilon\hat{\iota}$) or a Present merely used emphatically for the Future, like $\delta\mu\lambda\lambda\rho\gamma\hat{\omega}$ above quoted from Xen Cyr. V, 5. 13, or $\pi a\hat{\nu}\lambda\dot{\alpha}$ $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota$ from Plat. Rep. 473 D.

REMARK 2. The English (especially the colloquial language) seldom expresses the important distinction between this form of protasis and that of § 49, 1. Thus modern usage allows us to use the inexact expression if he wishes, not merely for εἰ βούλεται (if he now wishes), but also for εἰν βούληται (if he shall wish). The sense, however, generally makes the distinction clear.

Note 1. The Future Indicative with ϵi is very often used in the *protasis* in the same sense as the Subjunctive with $\epsilon a u$, sometimes alternating with it in the same sentence. This is

merely a more vivid form of expression than the Subjunctive, both corresponding to the English if I shall do this, &c. E. g.

Εἰ γὰρ ἀΑκιλλεὐς οἶος ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι μαχεῖται, οὐδὲ μίννυθ ἔξουσι ποδώκεα Πηλείωνα, if Αchilles shall fight, &c. Π. ΧΧ, 26. Εἰ δὲ σύ γ' ἐς πόλεμον πωλ ἡ σεαι, ἢ τέ σ' ὀίω ῥιγήσειν πόλεμόν γε, καὶ εἴ χ' ἐτερωθι πύθηαι. Π. Υ, 350. Εὶ δὲ πρὸς τούτοισι ἔτι τελευτήσει τὸν βίον εὖ, οὖτος ἐκεῖνος τὸν σὺ ζητεῖς ὅλβιος κεκλῆσθαι ἄξιός ἐστι. Η Τ. Ι, 32. (See Rem. 1.) Εὶ μὴ καθ έξεις γλῶσσαν, ἔσται σοι κακά. Ευπ. Αeg. Frag. 5. Εὶ δὲ μὴ τοῦτ' ἐπιδείξει, πῶς χρὴ ταύτη τῆ προκλήσει προσέχειν ὑμᾶς τὸν νοῦν; DEM. Aph. Ι. 829, 28. Εἰ δ' ὑμεῖς ἄλλο τι γνώσεσθε, ὁ μὴ γένοιτο, τίνα οἴεσθε αὐτὴν ψυχὴν ἔξειν; DEM. Aph. Η, 842, 15. (Referring to the same thing, p. 834, 24, Demosthenes had said ἀν γὰρ ἀποφύγη με οὖτος, ὁ μὴ γένοιτο, τὴν ἐπωβελίαν ὀφλήσω.) ⁴Ην ἐθ έλωμεν ἀποθνήσκειν ὑπὲρ τῶν δικαίων, εὐδοκιμήσομεν εἰ δὲ φο βησόμεθα τοὺς κινδύνους, εἰς πολλὰς ταραχὰς καταστήσομεν ὑμᾶς αὐτούς. Isoc. Archid. p. 138 Α. § 107.

This use of the Future must not be confounded with its less common use in present conditions, § 49, 1, N. 3, where it is not equiva-

lent to the Subjunctive.

NOTE 2. In the Homeric language the following peculiarities appear in this construction:—

(a.) The Subjunctive with $\kappa \dot{\epsilon}$ is sometimes used in the apodosis instead of the Future Indicative, thus making the apodosis correspond in form to the protasis. E. g.

El δέ κε μὴ δώησιν, ἐγὰ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι, and if he do not give her up, I will take her myself. Π. I, 324. (Compare I, 137.) This gives a form of sentence analogous to that in which the Optative is used in both protasis and apodosis. See § 87, Note. (For the use of δέ in apodosis, see below, § 57.)

- (b.) "H ν is the only contraction of ϵi $\tilde{a}\nu$ found in Homer. The most common Homeric form is, however, $\epsilon \tilde{i}$ $\kappa \epsilon$ (sometimes $\epsilon \tilde{i}$ $\delta \epsilon'$ $\kappa \epsilon$). Et $\tilde{a}\nu$ is rarely found, as II. III, 288.
- (c.) Εἴ κε or αἴ κε is sometimes found even with the Future Indicative in Homer. E. g.

Αἴ κεν ἄνευ ἐμέθεν . . . Ἰλίου πεφιδήσεται, οὐδ' ἐθελήσε ἐκπέρσαι, ἴστω τοῦτο. Π. ΧΥ, 213.

For $\kappa \dot{\epsilon}$ (and even $d\nu$) with the Future in apodosis, see § 37, 2.

(d.) The simple ϵi (without $\tilde{a}\nu$ or $\kappa \epsilon$) is often used with the Subjunctive in Homer, apparently in the same sense as $\epsilon i \kappa \epsilon$ or the Attic $\epsilon \hat{a}\nu$. E. g.

Εὶ δ' αὖ τις ρ΄αί η σι θεῶν ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντω, τλήσομαι ἐν στήθεσσιν ἔχων ταλαπενθέα θυμόν. Οd. V, 221. Οὐδὲ πόλινδε ἔρχομαι, εἰ μή πού τι περίφρων Πηνελόπεια ἐλθέμεν ὸ τρύν η σιν. Οd. ΧΙV, 872.

Note 3. (a.) The Homeric use of the simple ϵi with the Subjunctive continues in lyric poetry, and is found in the chorus of the Attic drama, and even in some passages of the ordinary dialogue. E. g.

Εἰγὰρ θάνης καὶ τελευτήσας ἀφῆς. Soph. Aj. 496. Δυστάλαινα τἄρ' ἐγὼ, εἴ σου στερη θῶ. Soph. O. C. 1442. Εἰ μή σ' ἐκφάγω ἐκ τῆσδε τῆς γῆς, οὐδέποτε βιώσομαι. Arist. Eq. 698. Εἴ τις εὖ τάσχων λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούση. Pind. Isth. IV, 16.

(b.) In Attic prose, this construction is extremely rare, and its existence is denied by many high authorities; if we follow the Mss., however, we must admit it in a few passages, as Thuc. VI, 21: Οὖ ναυτικῆς στρατιᾶς μόνον δεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πεζὸν πολὺν ξυμπλεῖν, ἄλλως τε καὶ εἰ ξυστῶσιν αἱ πόλεις φοβηθεῖσαι. (Here only a few of the worst Mss. read ἥν for εἰ.)

NOTE 4. For the change from the Subjunctive to the Optative after secondary tenses in indirect discourse, see § 74, 1.

2. When a supposed future case is stated less distinctly and vividly than it would be stated by the Subjunctive (as in English, if I should go), the protasis takes the Optative with ei.

The apodosis here denotes what would be the result if the condition of the protasis should be fulfilled, and takes the Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$. E. g.

Εἰ ἔλθοι, πάντ' ἃν ἴδοι, if he should go, he would see all. Εἴ σ νὖτως ἐθέλοι φιλέειν κήδοιτό τε θυμῷ, τῷ κέν τις κείνων γε καὶ ἐκλελάθοιτο γάμοιο, if she should be willing thus to love y.u, &c Od. III, 223. 'Η κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παίδες, ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κε χαροίατο θυμῷ, εἰ σφῶιν τάδε πάντα πυθοίατο μαρναμένοιιν. II. I, 255. (See § 47, 2.) 'Αλλ' εἴ μοί τι πίθοιο, τό κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη. II. VII, 28. Εἴης φορητὸς οὐκ ᾶν, εἰ πράσσοις καλῶς. ΑΕΝΟΗ. Ρτοπ. 979. Εἰ δέ τις τοὺς κρατοῦντας τοῦ πλήθους ἐπ' ἀρετὴν προτρέψειεν, ἀμφοτέρους ᾶν ὀνήσειε. ISOC. ad Nicocl. p. 16 C. § 8. Εἴ τις τῶν σοι συνόντων ἐπαρθείη ποιεῦν ᾶ τυγχάνεις εὐλογῶν, πῶς οὐκ ᾶν ἀθλιώτατος εἴη; ISOC. Busir. p. 230 C. § 47. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ᾶν Μήδοκός με ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπαινοίη, εἰ ἐξελαύνοιμι τοὺς εὐεργέτας. ΧΕΝ. Απ. VII, 7, 11. Εἰ μὴ δυνατὸν ὑπ' αὐτῶν εἴη σωθῆναι, ἀποκτείναιμ' ᾶν ἐμαυτόν. DEM. Eubul. 1320, 25. Οὐδ' εἰ πάντες ἔλθοιεν Πέρσαι, πλήθει γε οὺχ ὑπερβαλογία εἴη, εἰ φοβοῖτο τὸν θάνατον ὁ τοιοῦτος; Plat. Phaed. 68 Β. Οἰκος δ' αὐτὸς, εἰ φθογγήν λάβοι, σαφέστατ ᾶν λέξειεν ΑΕΝ. Αg. 37. Πῶς οὺν οὖκ ᾶν οἰκτρότατα πάντων ἐγὼ πεπονθὼι.

εἴην, εἰ ἐμὲ ψηφίσαιντο εἶναι ξένον; how then should I not have suffered (lit. be in the condition of having suffered) the most pitiable of all things, if they should vote me a foreigner? DEM. Eubul. 1312, 17. (See § 18, 1, and examples of the Perfect Optative there quoted.)

REMARK. (a.) This form of the conditional sentence must be especially distinguished from that of § 49, 2; the more so, as we often translate both $\epsilon l\eta \ \ddot{a}\nu$ and $\ddot{\eta}\nu \ \ddot{a}\nu$ by the same English expression, \dot{u} would be; although the latter implies that the supposition of the protasis is a false one, while the former implies no opinion of the speaker as to the truth of the supposition.

(b.) On the other hand, the distinction beween this form and that of § 50, 1 is less marked, and it is often of slight importance which of the two is used in a particular case. Thus it is often nearly indifferent in English whether we say if we shall go (or if we go), it will be well, or if we should go, it would be well; in Greek, the former is εαν ελθωμεν, καλώς εξει, and the latter is εὶ ελθοιμεν, καλώς αν έχοι. (See § 48, I, B, Rem. 2.) In writing Greek, this distinction can generally be made, by first observing the form of the apodosis in English; if that is expressed by would, it should be translated by the Greek Optative with $d\nu$; if it is expressed by will, it should be translated by the Future Indicative. (Other forms of the apodosis, as the Imperative, will present no difficulty.) The form to be used in the protasis will then appear from the rules for dependence of Moods (§ 32 and § 34); the Optative will require another Optative with εl in the dependent protasis (i. e. the form of § 50, 2, εl ελθοιμεν, καλώς αν έχοι); while the future Indicative or any other primary form will require a Subjunctive with ¿áv, or a Future Indicative with el (i. e. the form of § 50, 1, ear en de mer, rands exel, οτ εί έλευσόμε θα, καλώς έξει).

In indirect discourse we often find an Optative in protasis, which merely represents the same tense of the Subjunctive or Indicative in the direct discourse. See § 69, 1; § 74, 1; and § 77.

'Ο δὲ χερμάδιον λάβε χειρὶ Τυδείδης, μέγα ἔργον, δ οὐ δύο γ' ἄνδρε φέροιεν, which two men could not lift (if they should try). II. V, 303. (See § 52, 2.) Τέαν, Ζεῦ, δύναστιν τίς αλθρῶν ὑπερβασία κατ άσχοι; Soph. Ant. 605. 'Αλλ' ὑπέρτολμον ἀνδρὸς Φρόνημα τίς λέγοι; Aesch. Choeph. 594. "Εστ' οὖν ὅπως "Αλκηστις ές γῆρας μόλοι; Eur. Alc. 52. Οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως λέξαιμι τὰ ψευδῆ καλά. Aesch. Ag. 620. Οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτω μείζονα μοῖραν νείμαιμ' ἢ σοί. Aesch. Prom. 292. Πῶς οὖν τάδ', ὡς εἴπ οι τις, ἐξημάρτανες; i. e. as one might say. Eur. Andr. 929. "Ωσπερ εἴποι τις τόπος, as one would say τόχος. (?) Arist. Av. 180.

NOTE 2. (a.) The adverb $\tilde{a}\nu$ is sometimes used with the Optative in the protasis, but only when the protasis is itself at the same time an apodoris, with another protasis expressed or implied. This is, of course, no exception to the general rule (§ 39); and it is to be noticed that the $\tilde{a}\nu$ in this case always belongs strictly to the verb, and never joins the ϵl to form $\ell a\nu$. E. g.

Οὔτοι παντελῶς, οὐδ' εἰ μὴ ποιήσαιτ' ἃν τοῦτο, εὐκαταφρόνητόν εστιν, it is not wholly to be despised, even if you would not do this (if an opportunity should occur). DEM. Phil. I, 44, 30. Καὶ ἐγὼ, εἴπερ ἄλλῷ τῷ ἀνθρώπων πειθοίμην ἃν, καὶ σοὶ πείθομαι, if I would trust any other man (if he should give me his word), I trust you. PLAT. Prot. 329 B. Εἴ γε μηδὲ δυῦλον ἀκρατῆ δεξαίμεθ' ἄν, πῶς οὐκ ἄξιον αὐτόν γε φυλάξασθαι τοιοῦτον γενέσθαι; if we would not take even a slave who was intemperate (sc. if one should be offered), &c. XEN. Mem. I, 5, 3. (Such conditional sentences as the three preceding belong properly under § 49, 1. Compare the last example under § 54, Rem.) See § 49, 2, N. 4, b.

So occasionally in Homer; as II. V, 273, εὶ τούτω κε λάβοιμεν, ἀροίμεθά κε κλέος ἐσθλόν, if we could (in any case) obtain these, we should gain great glory; and II. I, 60, Εἴ κεν θάνατόν γε φύγοιμεν, if we would escape death (where εἰ θάνατον φύγοιμεν would mean if we

should ever escape death).

(b.) Commonly, however, when ϵ_i^{α} κ_{ϵ} occurs in Homer, $\kappa_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon}$ belongs to the ϵ_i^{α} , and no force of an apodosis is perceptible. Here, as in final clauses (§ 44, 1, N. 3, a), the $\kappa_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon}$ adds nothing to the sense that can be expressed in English. E. g.

Πῶς αν έγω δέοιμι μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν, εἴ κεν Αρης οἴχοιτο χρέος καὶ δεσμὸν ἀλύξας. Οd. VIII, 352. Τῶν κέν τοι χαρίσαιτο πατὴρ ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα, εἴ κεν ἐμὲ ζωὸν πεπύθοιτ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν 'Αχαιῶν. II. VI, 49.

But if the $\kappa \dot{\epsilon}$ is separated from the $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon}$ (except by $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$, $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$, $\tau \dot{\epsilon}$, $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$, &c.), or if the sense shows clearly that it belongs to the verb, it is the sign of an apodosis, as in the Homeric examples under (a).

See § 49, 2, N. 4, a.

- NOTE 3. It follows from § 26, that the Future Optative cannot be used in protasis or apodosis, except in indirect discourse to represent a Future Indicative of the direct discourse.
- NOTE 4. For a rare Homeric use of the Optative for the Imperfect or Aorist Indicative, see § 49, 2, N. 6.

II. Present and Past General Suppositions.

§ 51. A present or past supposition is said to be general, when the protasis refers indefinitely to any one of a series or class of acts, and not to a definite act or

a definite series of acts. The apodosis must express a customary or repeated action or a general truth.

Here the protasis takes the Subjunctive with can after primary tenses, and the Optative with can after secondary tenses. The apodosis may take the Present or Imperfect Indicative, or any other form which implies repetition. E. g.

"Ην ποτε δασμὸς ἴκηται, σοὶ τὸ γέρας πολὺ μείζον (sc. ἐστίν), if ever a division comes, your prize is always much greater. II. I, 166.
Ήν ἐγγὺς ἔλθη θάνατος, οὐδεὶς βούλεται θνήσκειν, if (or when) death comes near, no one is (ever) willing to die. Eur. Alc. 671.
"Απα κόγος, ἂν ἀπῆ τὰ πράγματα, μάταιόν τι φαίνεται καὶ κενόν, all speech, if deeds are wanting, appears mere emptiness and vanity. DEM. Ol. II, 21, 20. Διατελεῖ μισῶν, οὐκ ἤν τίς τι αὐτὸν ἀδικῆ, ἀλλ' ἐάν τινα ὑποπτεύση βελτίονα ἑαντοῦ εἶναι, he continues to hate, not if any one wrongs him, but if he ever suspects that any one is better than himself. Xen. Cyr. V, 4, 35. Εὐλαβοῦ τὰς διαβολὰς, κᾶν ψευδεῖς ὧσιν, beware of slanders, even when they are false. Isoc. Demon. p. 5 C. § 17.

Εὶ δέ τινας θορυβουμένους αἴσθοιτο, τὸ αἴτιον τούτου σκοπῶν κατασβεννύναι τὴν ταραχὴν ἐπειρᾶτο, whenever he saw any making a disturbance, he always tried, &c. Xen. Cyr. V, 3, 55. Οὐκ ἀπελείπετο ἔτι αὐτοῦ, εἰ μἡ τι ἀναγκαῖον εἴη, he never left him, unless there was some necessity for ἰι. Xen. Mem. IV, 2, 40. Εἴ τις ἀντείπο., εὐθὺς τεθνήκει, if any one refused, he was immediately put to death. ΤΗυς. VIII, 66. Ἡν τοῖς μὲν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐπικούρημα τῆς χιόνος, εἴ τις κινοῖτο. Χεn. An. IV. 5, 13. ἀλλὶ εἴ τι μὴ φέροιμεν, ἄτρυνεν φέρειν. Ευr. Alc. 755. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἶδον αὐτὸν τάχιστα, συλλαβόντες ἄγουσιν ἄντικρυς ὡς ἀποκτενοῦντες, οὖπερ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀπέσφαττον, εῖ τινα ληστὴν ἡ κακοῦργον συλλάβοιεν, i. e. where they had been in the habit of killing any others whom they took. Lys. Agor. p. 137, § 78.

The Optative in these examples, referring to past time, must be especially distinguished from the Optative in ordinary protasis (§ 50, 2), referring to the future. Et and $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{a}\nu$ in this construction are almost equivalent to $\delta\tau\epsilon$ or $\delta\tau a\nu$ (which are the more common expressions), and the protasis has precisely the same construction as

the relative sentences of § 62.

The Present and Aorist Subjunctive and Optative here do not differ except as explained in Remark before § 12.

REMARK. The gnomic Aorist, and the other gnomic and iterative tenses of § 30, can be used in the apodosis of these general propositions. The gnomic Aorist, as usual, is considered a primary tense (§ 32, 2). E. g.

NOTE 1. The Optative in this construction is not found in Homer, although it is very common in the equivalent relative sentences (§ 62).

NOTE 2. Here, as in ordinary protasis, the poets sometimes use the simple ϵi with the Subjunctive instead of $\epsilon i \omega$. (See § 50, 1, N. 3.) E. g.

Εἴπερ γάρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτῆμαρ καταπέψη, Άλλά γε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἔχει κότον, ὄφρα τελέσση. Π. Ι, 81.

Εὶ δὲ φύγη μὲν κῆρα τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο, Νικήσας δ' αἰχμῆς ἀγλαὸν εὖχος ἔλη, Πάντες μιν τιμῶσιν ὁμῶς νέοι ἦδὲ παλαιοὶ,

Πολλά δὲ τερπνά παθών ἔρχεται εἰς ᾿Αίδην. ΤΥΚΤ. ΧΙΙ, 35.

'Αλλ' ἄνδρα, κ εἶ τις ἢ σοφὸς, τὸ μανθάνειν Πόλλ' αἰσχρὸν οὐδὲν καὶ τὸ μὴ τείνειν ἄγαν. Soph. Ant. 710.

Note 3. The Indicative is sometimes found in the place of the Subjunctive or Optative in a general protasis of this kind. Here the speaker merely refers to one of the many cases in which the event may occur, as if it were the only case, — that is, he states the supposition as if it were particular, and not general. E. g.

Εἴ τις δύο ἡ καὶ πλέους τις ἡμέρας λογίζεται, μάταιός ἐστιν, if any one counts upon two or even more days, he is a fool. Soft. Trach. 944. Έλευθέρως πολιτεύομεν, οὐ δι' ὀργῆς τὸν πέλας, εἰ καθ' ἡδονήν τι $\delta \rho \ddot{\alpha}$, ἔχοντες, i. e. not (having a habit of) being angry with our neighbor, if he acts in any case as he pleases. Thuc. II, 37. (Here the Indicative $\delta \rho \ddot{\alpha}$ is used as if some particular act of some one neighbor, and not any act of any neighbor, were in the speaker's mind.) Εἴ τίς τι ἐπηρώτα, ἀπεκρίνοντο, if any one asked anything, they replied (to all such). Thuc. VII, 10. Ἐἰωξιοὐκ εἴ τις κακῶς πάσχων ἡ μύνετο, ἀλλ' εἴ τις εὖεργετούμενος ἀχάριστος φαίνοιτο. ΧΕΝ. Ages. XI, 3. (Here, without any apparent reason, the writer changes from the Indicative to the Optative.) See § 62. N. 1.

This use of the Indicative is exceptional in Greek, but it is the regular construction in Latin and English. See § 48, II Rem. 2.

Ellipsis and Substitution in Protasis or Apodosis.

§ 52. 1. Very often the protasis is not expressed in its regular form with ϵi or $\epsilon \acute{a}\nu$, but is either *implied* in something that precedes or follows, or *expressed* in a participle, a preposition with its case, an adverb like $o \rlap/ \nu \tau \omega s$, or some other part of the sentence.

When a participle takes the place of a protasis, it is always in the same tense in which the finite verb which it represents would itself have stood after ϵi or $\epsilon \alpha \nu$, in the Indicative, Subjunctive, or Optative. (See § 109, 6.) The Present participle stands for both Present and Imperfect, and the Perfect for both Perfect and Pluperfect. (See § 16, 2; § 18, 3, Rem.) E. g.

Οὔτε ἐσθίουσι πλείω ἢ δύνανται φέρειν, διαρραγεῖεν γὰρ ἄν · οὔτ ἀμφιέννυνται πλείω ἢ δύνανται φέρειν, ἀποπνιγεῖεν γὰρ ἄν, they do not eat more than they can bear, for (if they should) they would burst, &c. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 2, 21. Αὐτοὶ ἀν ἐπορεύθησαν ἢ οἱ ἄλλοι τὰ δ' ὑποζύγια οἰκ ἢν ἄλλη ἢ ταὐτη ἐκβῆναι, they would have gone themselves where the others went; but the animals could not go otherwise than as they did. ΧΕΝ. ΑΝ. IV, 2, 10. Sο ἢ γὰρ ἀν λωβήσαιο, II. I, 232.

Τοῦτο ποιοῦντες εὖ πράξουσιν (i. e. ἐἀν ποιῶσιν), if they shall do this (habitually), they will prosper. Τοῦτο ποιήσαντες εὖ πράξουσιν (i. e. ἐἀν ποιήσωσιν), if they shall (once) do this, they will prosper. Τοῦτο ποιοῦντες εὖ ὰν πράττοιεν (i. e. εἰ ποιοῖεν), if they should do this (habitually), they would prosper. Τοῦτο ποιήσαντες εὖ ὰν πράττοιεν (i. e. εἰ ποιήσαντες εὖ ὰν πράττοιεν (i. e. εἰ ποίουν), if they would prosper. Τοῦτο ποιοῦντες εὖ ὰν ἔπραττον (i. e. εἰ ἐποίουν), if they were doing this (or if they had been doing this), they would be in prosperity. Τοῦτο ποιήσαντες εὖ ὰν ἔπραττον (i. e. εἰ ἐποίησαν), if they had done this,

they would be in prosperity.

Πῶς δῆτα δίκης ο ὖσης ὁ Ζεὺς οὐκ ἀπόλωλεν τὸν πατέρ' αὐτοῦ δήσας; i. e. how is it that Zeus has not been destroyed, if Justice exists? Arist. Nub. 904. (Here δίκης οὔσης represents εἰ δίκη ἐστίν.) 'λλλ' εἰσόμεσθα δόμους παραστείχοντες (i. e. ἐὰν παραστείχωμεν), but we shall know, if we shall enter the house. Soph. Ant. 1255. Σὶ δὲ κλ ὑ ων εἴσει τάχα (i. e. ἐὰν κλύης), but you will soon know, if you listen. Arist. Av. 1375. So μὴ μαθών, unless I learn, for ἐὰν μὴ μάθω, Nub. 792. Καὶ κεν τοῦτ' ἐθέλοιμι Διός γε διδόντος αἰρέσθαι, and this I should like to obtain, if Zeus would only give it. Od. I, 390. (Here Διὸς διδόντος = εἰ Ζεὺς διδοίη.) Τοιαῦτά τὰν γυναιξὶ συνναίων ἔχοις (i. e. εἰ συνναίοις), such things would you suffer, if you should

live with women. Aesch. Sept. 195. Οὐδ' αν σιωπήσαιμι την άτην όρων στείχουσαν αστοίς (i. e. εί δρώμι). SOPH. Ant. 185. 'Αθηναίων δε το αυτό τουτο παθόντων, διπλασίαν αν την δύναμιν εικάζεσθαι (αίμαι), but if the Athenians should ever suffer this (παθόντων = εί πάθοιεν), I think it would be inferred that their power was twice as great. Thuc. I, 10. (Here nothing but the context shows that παθόντων does not represent εἰ ἔπαθον, if they had ever suffered.) Μαμμαν δ' αν αιτήσαντος ηκόν σοι φέρων αν άρτον, and if you ever asked for something to eat, I used to come bringing you bread. ARIST. Nub. 1383. (Here αἰτήσαντος represents εἰ αἰτήσειας in a general supposition, § 51. For ηκον αν see § 30, 2, and § 42, 3.) Πρὶν γενέσθαι ηπίστησεν αν τις ακούσας (i. e. εί ήκουσεν), before it happened, any one would have disbelieved such a thing, if he had heard it. ΤΗυς. VII, 28. Οὐ γὰρ ἃν μεταπείθειν ὑμᾶς εζήτει μὴ τοιαύτης ούσης της ύπαρχούσης ύπολήψεως, for he would not be seeking to change your minds, if such were not the prevailing opinion (i. e. el un τοιαύτη ήν). DEM. Cor. 304, 1. Μή κατηγορήσαντος Αλσχίνου μηδεν έξω της γραφης ούδ αν έγω λόγον ούδενα εποιούμην έτερον (i. e. εί μη κατηγόρησεν). Ib. 236, 28. Τὰ αὐτὰ ᾶν ἔπραξε καὶ πρώτη λαχοῦσα (i. e. εἰ πρώτη ελαχεν), it (the soul) would have done the same, even if it had had the first choice by the lot. PLAT. Rep. X, 620 D So THUC. VII, 13, 1.

Τὸ μὲν ἐπ' ἐκείνω πολλάκις ἃν διελύθησαν, if it had depended on him, they often would have been disbanded. Isoc. Pan. p. 70 B. § 142. Διά γε ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς πάλαι ἃν ἀπολώλειτε, if it had depended on yourselves, you would long ago have been ruined. DEM. Cor. 242, 10. καθ' ύμᾶς.) Πάλαι γὰρ ἄν ἔνεκά γε ψηφισμάτων έδεδώκει δίκην, for, if decrees were of any avail, he would long ago have suffered punishment. DEM. Ol. III, 32, 16. (Here the protasis is implied in -ἔνεκα ψηφισμάτων.) Οὔτω γὰρ οὐκέτι τοῦ λοιποῦ πάσχοιμεν ἃν κακῶς, for in that case we should no longer suffer. DEM. Phil. I, 44, 12. So ὡς οὖτω περιγενόμενος ἄν, ΧΕΝ. ΑΠ. Ι, 1, 10. Οὐδ' ἄν δικαίως ές κακὸν πέσοιμί τι. SOPH. Ant. 240.

In these cases the form of the apodosis will generally show what

form of protasis is implied. When the apodosis is itself expressed by an Infinitive or Participle (§ 53), as in THUC. I, 10, the form of the protasis is shown only by the general sense of the passage.

REMARK. The Future participle is not used in protasis to represent the Future Indicative, as it would denote time future relatively to the time of the apodosis (§ 28), which the Future Indicative in protasis does not do. The Present and Aorist participles, representing the Present and Aorist Subjunctive, express future conditions, thus making the Future participle unnecessary. Aorist participle in protasis can always represent an Aorist Subjunc tive in the sense explained § 20, N. 1.

An ellipsis of the verb of the protasis takes place Note 1. in the Homeric εἰ δ' ἄγε, for εἰ δὲ βούλει, ἄγε, and in such expressions as εὶ μὴ διὰ τοῦτο, had it not been for this.

ç1

El δ ἄγε, τοι κεφαλῆ κατανεύσομαι. Π. Ι, 524. El δ' ἄγε μὴν, πείρησαι, ΐνα γνώωσι καὶ οἴδε, but if you wish, come now, try it. Π. Ι, 302. Καὶ εἰ μὴ διὰ τὸν πρύτανιν, ἐνέπεσεν ἄν, and, had it not been for the Prytanis, he would have been thrown in. Plat. Gorg. 516 Ε. (Compare διά γε ὑμᾶς, DEM. Cor. 242, 10, quoted § 52, 1.) Οὐ γὰρ ώς εἰ μὴ διὰ Λακεδαιμονίους, οὐδ' ώς εἰ μὴ διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸ, ἐσώθησαν ᾶν οἱ Φωκεῖς, οὐχ οῦτω τότε ἀπήγγειλεν, for he did not then report that, if it had not been for the Lacedaemonians,—or if they had not refused to receive Proxenus,—or if it had not been for Hegesippus,—or if it had not been for this and that,—the Phocians would have been saved. DEM. F. L. 364, 12. So εἰ μὴ κρεμάσας, had I not done it by hanging μρ, &c. Arist. Nub. 229. So in alternatives: see Note 2. (Cǐ. § 53, Note 1.)

Note 2. In alternatives, ϵi $\delta \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta}$, otherwise, regularly introduces the latter clause, even when the former clause is negative. Et $\delta \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta}$ is much more common than $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\eta}$, even when $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \mu \dot{\nu}$ with the Subjunctive precedes. E. g.

Πρὸς ταῦτα μὴ τύπτ' εἰ δὲ μὴ, σαυτόν ποτ αἰτιάσει, therefore do not beat me; but if you do, you will have yourself to blame for it. Arist. Nub. 1433. Πόλεμον οὐκ εἴων ποιεῖν εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀναγκασθήσεσθαι ἔφασαν φίλους ποιεῖσθαι οῦς οὐ βούλονται, they said that otherwise (εἰ δὲ μή) they should be obliged, &c. Thuc. I, 28. Εἶπον (Παυσανία) τοῦ κήρυκος μὴ λείπεσθαι · εἰ δὲ μὴ, πόλεμον αὐτῷ Σπαρτιάτας προαγορεύειν, they ordered him not to be left behind by the herald : and if he should be (εἰ δὲ μἡ), (they told him) that the Spartans declared war against him. Id. I, 131. 'Εὰν μέν τι ὑμῖν δοκῶ λέγειν ἀληθὲς, ξυνομολογήσατε · εἰ δὲ μὴ, παντὶ λόγῷ ἀντιτείνετε. Plat. Phaed. 91 C. So in Dem. Phil. III, p. 129, 14, ἐὰν μὲν πείσητε, . . . εἰ δὲ μὴ, κ.τ.λ.

2. The protasis is often altogether suppressed, leaving only an Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ or an Indicative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ as an apodosis. Here some indefinite or general protasis is always implied; as if he pleased, if he could, if an opportunity should offer, if it were necessary, if it were true, if we should consider, if what is natural should happen, &c. E. g.

"Ισως ἃν οὖν τις ἐπιτιμήσειε τοῖς εἰρημένοις, perhaps some one might (if he pleased) find fault with what has been said. Isoc. Areop. p. 146 E. § 36. Τῷ οὐκ ἃν βασιλῆας ἀνὰ στόμ ἔχων ἀγορεύοις, therefore you should not take kings upon your tongue and talk (i. e. you would not, if you should do as you ought). Il. II, 250. Τοῦτο οῦτ τὸν οὖτος ἔχοι λέγειν οὖθ' ὑμεῖς πεισθείητε, neither would he be

able to say this (if he should try), nor would you believe it. Dem. Andr. 598, 20. 'Hδέως δ' ἀν ἔγωγ' ἐροίμην Λεπτίνην, but I would gladly ask Leptines (if an opportunity should offer). Id. Lept. 496, 8. Δειξάτω ὡς οἱ Θετταλοὶ νῦν οὐκ ἀν ἐλεύθεροι γένοιντο ἄσμενοι, let him show that they would not now gladly become free (if they could). Id. Ol. II, 20, 18. Βασίλεια οἰκοδομεῖν ἤρχετο, ὡς ἀν ἰκανὰ ἀπομάχεσθαι εἴη, so that it might be strong enough to fight from (if it should be necessary). XEN. Cyr. III, 1, 1.

Oὐ γὰρ ἦν ὅ τι ἀν ἐποιεῖτε, for there was nothing that you could have done (if you had tried). Dem Cor. 240, 15. Ποίων δ' ἀν ἔργων ἢ πόνων ἢ κινούνων ἀπ ἐστησαν; and from what acts, &c., would they have shrunk (i. e. if they had been required)? Isoc. Pan. p. 57 C. § 83. Πολλοῦ γὰρ ἀν ἢν ἄξια, for they would be worth much (if that were true). Plat. Rep. II, 374 D. So βουλοίμην ἄν (velim), I could wish (in a certain future case); ἐβουλόμην ἄν (vellem), I should

now wish (on a certain condition, not fulfilled).

Note. The Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$, used in this way, often has the force of a mild command or exhortation, and sometimes a sense approaching that of the Future Indicative. E. g.

Λέγοις ἄν, you may speak (lit. you could speak, if you should desire it), implying εὶ βούλοιο. Σὰ μὲν κομίζοις ᾶν σεαυτὸν ἢ θέλεις, you may take yourself off whither you please. Soph. Antig. 444. (This is merely a milder expression than κόμιζε.) Κλύοις ᾶν ἤδη, Φοίβε προστατήριε, i. e. hear now. Id. El. 637. Χωροῖς ᾶν εἴσω. Id. Phil. 674. So Antig. 1339. Ποῖ οὖν, ἔφην ἐγώ, τραποίμεθ ἀπι; in what other direction then, said I, shall we turn (lit. should we turn, if we should wish)? Plat. Euthyd. 290 A. Οὖκ ᾶν μεθείμην τοῦ θρόνου, I will not give up the throne. ARIST. Ran. 830.

Remark. In such examples as Hdt. I, 2, Έλλήνων τινάς φασι άρπάσαι Εὐρώπην $\cdot \epsilon$ ἴησαν δ' $\mathring{a}ν$ οὖτοι Κρῆτες, there is no exceptional use of the Optative with $\mathring{a}ν$ referring to the past; but the meaning is these would prove to be Cretans (if we should examine the case). So αὖται δὲ οὐκ $\mathring{a}ν$ πολλαὶ $\cdot ε$ ἴησαν, these would not prove (on investigation) to have been many. Thuc. I, 9.

§ 53. The apodosis may be expressed by an Infinitive or Participle, where the construction of the sentence requires it; each tense of the Infinitive or Participle representing its own tenses of the Indicative or Optative. (The Present includes also the Imperfect, and the Perfect also the Pluperfect.)

If a finite verb in the apodosis would have taken $\tilde{a}\nu$, that particle is joined with the Infinitive or Participle. The *Present* Infinitive or Participle with $\tilde{a}\nu$ represents

either an Imperfect Indicative with $a\nu$, or a Present Optative with $a\nu$; the Perfect, either a Pluperfect Indicative or a Perfect Optative; and the Aorist, either an Aorist Indicative or an Aorist Optative. (See § 41.) The context must decide in each case, whether an Infinitive or Participle with $a\nu$ represents the Indicative or the Optative. E. g.

Ἡγοῦμαι, εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, πάντα καλῶς ἔχειν, I believe that, if you are doing this, all is well. Ἡγοῦμαι, ἐὰν τοῦτο ποιῆτε, πάντα καλῶς ἔξειν, I believe that, if you (shall) do this, all will be well. Ἡγοῦμαι, εἰ τοῦτο ποιοῖτε, πάντα καλῶς ᾶν ἔχειν, I believe that, if you should do this, all would be well. Ἡγοῦμαι, εἰ τοῦτο ἐποιῆσατε, πάντα καλῶς ἀν ἔχειν, I believe that, if you had done this, all would (now) be well. Οἰδα ὑμᾶς, ἐὰν τοῦτο ποιῆτε, εὖ πράξοντας, I know that, if you do this, you will prosper. Σκέμματα τῶν ῥαδίως ἀποκτιννύντων καὶ ἀναβιωσκομένων γ' ᾶν, εἰ οἰοί τε ἦσαν, considerations for those who readily put men to death, and who would bring them to life again too, if they could. Plat. Crit. 48 C. (Ἁναβιωσκομένων ἄν = ἀνεβιώσκοντο ἄν.) See the examples of each tense of the Infinitive and Participle with ἄν, under § 41 and § 73.

Πῶς γὰρ οἴεσθε δυσχερῶς ἀκούειν 'Ολυνθίους, εἴ τίς τι λέγοι κατὰ Φιλίππου κατ ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους; how unwillingly do you think they heard it, if any one said anything against Philip in those times? DEM. Phil. II, 70, 25. (Here ἀκούειν represents the Imperfect ἄκουου, § 15, 3.) For an example of the Perfect Infinitive with ἀκ,

representing the Pluperfect, see § 41, 2.

NOTE 1. The apodosis is sometimes omitted for effect, when some such expression as it is well can be supplied, or some other apodosis at once occurs to the reader. E. g.

'Αλλ' εἰ μὲν δώσουσι γέρας μεγάθυμοι 'Αχαιοὶ, ἄρσαντες κατὰ θυμὸν, ὅπως ἀντάξιον ἔσται, — εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώωσιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι. Il. I. 135. (Here we must understand εὖ ἔξει, it will be well, or something similar, after ἔσται.) Εἴ περ γάρ κ' ἐθέλησιν 'Ολύμπιος ἀσ εροπητὴς ἐξ ἐδέων στυφελίξαι · — ὁ γὰρ πολὺ φέρτατός ἐστιν. Il. I, 580. (Here we must understand he can do it after the protasis. The following γάρ refers to this suppressed apodosis.) Εἰ μὲν ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἱκανῶς διδάσκω οἴους δεῖ πρὸς ἀλλήλους εἶναι · — εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ παρὰ τῶν προγεγενημένων μανθάνετε. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 7, 23. Compare Aesch. Prom. 835.

Note 2. Very often the apodosis is not directly expressed by the verb on which the protasis depends, but is merely implied in the context. Here the form of the protasis is determined by the implied apodosis. In such sentences ϵi or ϵdv

may generally be translated by supposing that, or in case that. E. g.

Τοὔνεκα νῦν τὰ σὰ γούναθ' ἱκάνομαι, αἴ κ' ἐθέλη σθα κείνου λυγρὸν όλεθοον ένισπείν, therefore I am now come to your knees, in case you shall be willing to tell me of his sad death (i. e. that you may tell me, in case you shall be willing). Od. III, 92. See Od. I, 94. (Here ικάνομαι does not contain the apodosis to αι κ' εθέλησθα, which is rather implied in what follows.) Των νῦν μιν μνήσασα παρέζεο καὶ λαβὲ γούνων, αί κεν πως έθέλησιν έπλ Τρώεσσιν αρήξαι, grasp his knees, in case he shall be willing to assist the Trojans (i. e. that you may cause him to assist them, if he shall be willing). Π. I, 408. So al κέν πως βούλεται (often explained as an indirect question), Il. I, 66. Οὐκοῦν έτι ελλείπεται το ην πείσωμεν ύμας ως χρη ήμας άφειναι; is not this then still left to us, - in case we shall persuade you that you must let us go (sc. to have you do this)? i. e. to have you let us go, if we shall persuade you that you must? PLAT. Rep. I, 327 C. "AKOUGOV Kai έμου, έάν σοι ταυτά δοκη, hear me also, in case the same shall please you, i. e. that then you may assent to it. Ib. II. 358 B. "Eri kai vûv άρας ποιούνται, εί τις έπικηρυκεύεται Πέρσαις, even to this day they invoke curses, if there is any one who sends heralds to the Persians. Isoc. Pan. p. 73 D. § 157. Ἱκέται πρὸς σὲ δεῦρ' ἀφίγμεθα, εἴ τινα πόλιν Φράσειας ημίν εύερον, we are come hither as suppliants to you, in case you should tell us of some fleecy city (implying thinking that we might go and live in such a city, if you should tell us of one). Arist. Av. 120. Oi δ' ὅκτειρον, εἰ άλωσοιντο, and others pitied them, in case they should be captured (i. e. thinking what they would suffer if they should be captured). XEN. An. I. 4. 7. Προς την πόλιν, εί έπιβοηθοΐεν, έχώρουν, they marched towards the city, in case they (the citizens) should rush out (i. e. that they might meet them, if they should rush out). THUC. VI, 100. Οὐδ' ἦν τοῦ πολέμου πέρας οὐδ' ἀπαλλαγή Φιλίππω, εὶ μὴ Θηβαίους καὶ Θετταλούς έχθρούς ποιήσειε τη πόλει, i. e. Philip saw that he could neither end nor escape the war, unless he should make the Thebans and Thessalians hostile to the city. PEM. Cor. 276, 1. See SOPH. O. C. 1770; PLAT. Rep. IV, 434 A.

In the examples from Homer and Plato the protasis belongs under § 50, 1, the implied apodosis referring to the future; in the example from Isocrates the protasis belongs under § 49, 1; in that from Aristophanes, under § 50, 2, the implied apodosis being in the Optative with $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ or some equivalent form; while in the next three the protasis has been changed (on the principle of indirect discourse) from ϵl $i\hbar \hbar \omega \sigma \nu r$ $i\pi l \sin \nu r$ $i\pi$

explained on the principle of this note.

Note 3. Sometimes the adverb $\tilde{a}\nu$ stands alone to represent the apodosis, when the verb to which it belongs can be easily supplied from the context. In like manner ϵi alone may represent the pro-

tasis. The expression ωσπερ αν εl (sometimes written as one word, ωσπερανεί, quasi) includes both cases. See § 42, 8, N. 2, with the examples.

"Ωσπερ with the participle (§ 109, N. 9) generally belongs to an apodosis understood. So in such expressions as ώσπερ εἰ λέγοις, as

(it would be) if you should say.

Note 4. When $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$ el is used for el $\mu \dot{\eta}$, unless, there is an ellipsis of an apodosis after $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$. E. g.

Οὐδὲ τὰ ἀνόματα οἶόν τε αὐτῶν εἰδέναι, πλην εἴ τις κωμωδοποιὸς τυγχάνει ὤν, it is not possible to know even their names, except (it is possible) in case one happens to be a comedian. Plat. Apol. 18 C.

REMARK. Expressions of a wish like εἰ γὰρ γένοιτο, O that it might be, and εἰ γὰρ ἐγένετο, O that it had been, are protases with the apodosis suppressed. See Rem. at the end of Sect. VI.

Mixed Constructions.—Irregularities in Protasis or Apodosis.

- § 54. The regular forms of protasis and apodosis explained above (§§ 49, 50, 51) include by far the greater number of the examples found in the classic authors. Many cases remain, however, in which the protasis and apodosis do not belong to the same form. These admit of various explanations:—
- 1. (a.) When an Indicative in the protasis (in either of the constructions of § 49, 1 or 2) is followed by an Optative with ἄν in the apodosis, the latter properly belongs to an implied protasis in the Optative (on the principle of § 52, 2). Thus, in the sentence εἰ ταῦτα οῦτως ἔχει, οἰκ ᾶν δικαίως κολάζοιτο, if this is so, he would not justly be punished, κολάζοιτο ἄν belongs to a protasis in the Optative, if justice should be done, implied in δικαίως; while the protasis εἰ ἔχει belongs as a condition to the expressed apodosis with its implied protasis. The sense therefore is, if this is so, (the result is that) he would not be punished if justice should be done. The same principle applies to a primary tense of the Indicative in protasis, followed by a secondary tense with ἄν in apodosis.

This is sometimes the meaning, when a Subjunctive or Future Indicative (§ 50, 1) is in the protasis, with an Optative with av in the apodosis. (See the last two examples.) E. g.

Εί δέ τις αθαιάτων γε κατ' οὐρανοῦ είλήλουθας, οὐκ αν εγωγε θεοίσιν επουρανίοισι μαχοίμην, but if thou art one of the immortals come from heaven, I would not fight against the Gods of heaven. Il. VI, 128. (Here the principal protasis to μαχοίμην ἄν is implied, if I should have my choice.) Πολλή γὰρ αν εὐδαιμονία εἴη περὶ τοὺς νέους, el els per povos aurous δ la ϕ be ipel, ol δ anno δ ϕ enough of there would (naturally) be great happiness, &c. Plat. Apol. 25 B. "Ωστ' εί μοι καὶ μέσως ἡγούμενοι μαλλον έτέρων προσείναι αὐτα πολεμείν έπείσθητε, οὐκ αν εἰκότως νῦν τοῦ γε ἀδικεῖν αἰτίαν Φεροίμην, if you were persuaded to make war by thinking, &c., I should not now justly be charged with injustice. THUC. II, 60. (Here a protasis to φεροίμην ἄν is implied in εἰκότως.) Εἰ γὰρ οὖτοι ὀρθῶς ἀπέστησαν, ὑμεῖς ὰν οὐ χρεὼν ἄρχοιτε, for if these had a right to secede, it would follow that your dominion is unjust. Id. III, 40. El vûv ye δυστυχούμεν, πώς τάναντι άν πράττοντες οὐ σωζοίμεθ' άν; ifnow we are unfortunate, how should we not be safe if we should do the opposite? Arist. Ran. 1449. (Here πράττοντες = εἰ πράττοιμεν is the principal protasis to which the optative refers.) Εί τοῦτ' ἐπεχείρουν λέγειν, οὺκ ἔσθ' ὅστις οὺκ ἃν εἰκότως ἐπιτιμήσει έμοι, if I were undertaking to say this (§ 49, 2), every one would censure me with reason (i. e. εί τὰ εἰκότα ποιήσειεν). Dem. Cor. 296, 24. (Here many Mss., and Dion. Hal. p. 1054, read ἐπετίμησε, the ordinary apodosis.) Εἰ μηδένα τῶν ἄλλων ἱππεύειν εἴασαν, οὐκ αν δικαίως δργίζοισθε αυτοίς. Lys. Alcib. II, § 8.

Καίτοι τότε τὸν Ὑπερείδην, εἴπερ ἀληθῆ μου νῦν κατηγορεῖ, μᾶλλον τὸν εἰκότως ἡ τόνδ' ἐδίωκ εν, and yet, if he is now making true charges against me, he would then have prosecuted Hypereides with much more reason than this man. Dem. Cor. 302, 24. (Here ἐδίωκεν ἄν refers chiefly to the implied protasis, if he had done what was more reason-

able.) Such examples seldom occur.

Οὐδέ γὰρ ἄν πολλαὶ γέφυραι ὧσιν, ἔχοιμεν ἃν ὅποι φυγόντες ήμεῖς σωθώμεν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙ, 4, 19. (Here the implied protasis is

if we should wish to escape.) See An. V, 1, 9.

Φρούριον εἰ ποιήσονται, τῆς μὲν γῆς βλάπτοιεν ἄν τι μέρος, οὐ μέντοι ἰκανόν γε ἔσται κωλύειν ἡμᾶς, κ.τ.λ., if they shall build a fort, they might (under favorable circumstances) injure some part of our land; but it will not be sufficient to prevent us, &c. Thuc. I, 142.

(b.) A Subjunctive or Future Indicative in the protasis sometimes depends on an Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ in the apodosis, when no other protasis can readily be supplied. This expresses the protasis more vividly than the regular Optative. (See § 50, 2, Rem. b, and § 34, 1, b.) It must be remembered also that the Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ is sometimes merely a softened expression for the Future Indicative (§ 52, Note). E. g.

Έὰν τοῦτο ποιήσω, καλῶς ἄν ἔχοι, if I do this, it would be well. (Here the irregularity is the same in English as in Greek: the regu-

lar form in both would be either έὰν τοῦτο ποιήσω, καλῶς ἔξει, if I d. this, it will be well; or εἰ τοῦτο ποιήσαιμι, καλῶς ἄν ἔχοι, if I should do this, it would be well.) Καὶ οὕτως ᾶν δεινότατα πάντων πάθοι εν, εἰ οὖτοι ὁμόψηφοι κατ' ἐκείνων τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῖς τριάκοντα γεν ήσονται Lys. Agor. p. 139, 6. § 94. (Here we should expect εἰ γένοιντο.) Τῶν ἀτοποτάτων μέντ' ᾶν εἵη, εἰ, ὰ νῦν ἄνοιαν ὀφλισκάνων ὅμως ἐκλαλεῖ, ταῦτα δυνηθεῖς μὴ πράξει. Dem. Ol. I, 16, 25. 'Ήν οὖν μάθης μοι τὸν ἄδικον τοῦτον λόγον, οἰκ ᾶν ἀπο δοίην οὐδ' ᾶν ὀβολὸν οὐδενί, if you shall learn this for me, I will not (or I would not) pay even an obol to any one. Arist. Nub. 116. (This and many other examples might be explained equally well on either principle, a or b.)

- 2. (a.) An Optative in the protasis sometimes depends upon a primary tense of the Indicative or an Imperative in the apodosis. This arises from the slight distinction between the Subjunctive and Optative in protasis, as ἐἀν ἔχη and εἰ ἔχοι, for which the Latin has but one form, si habeat. (See § 48, I, B, Rem. 2.) In fact, the irregularity in εἰ τοῦτο γένοιτο, πάντα καλῶς ἔξει, is precisely the same as in the English if this should happen, all will be well, where the more regular apodosis would be all would be well, as in Greek, πάντα καλῶς ἄν ἔχοι. Ε. g.
- (b.) The Optative sometimes stands in the protasis, when the apodosis contains a primary tense of a verb denoting necessity, obligation, propriety, possibility, &c., with an Infinitive, the two forming an expression that is nearly equivalent in sense to an Optative with a. E. g.

El γὰρ εἴησαν δύο τινὲς ἐναντίοι νόμοι, οὐκ ἀμφοτέροις ἔνι δήπον ψηφίσασθαι, for if there should be two laws opposed to each other, you could not surely vote for both. Dem. Timocr. 711, 8. (See § 63, 4, b.) This is analogous to the use of the Imperfect of the same verbs, explained in § 49, 2, Note 3. There, for example, ἐνῆν αὐτῷ ἐλθεῖν, he could have gone, is nearly equivalent to ἥλθεν ἄν, and here ἔνευτιν αὐτῷ ἐλθεῖν, he could go, is nearly equivalent to ἕλθοι ἄν.

3. A few irregular constructions remain, which can be explained only as cases of anacoluthon, in which the speaker adapts his apodosis to a form of protasis different from that which he has actually used. E. g.

Έγω μὲν ἃν, εἶ ἔχοιμι, ὡς τάχιστα ὅπλα ἐποιούμην πᾶσι Πέρσαις. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. II, 1, 9. (Here ἐποιιύμην ἄν is used as if εἶ εἶχον, if I were able, had preceded. We should expect ποιοίμην ἄν, which is found in one Ms.) Εἶ μὲν γὰρ εἶς γυναῖκα σωφρονεστέραν ξίφος μεθεῖμεν, συσκλεὴς ἃν ἦν φόνος. Ευκ. Orest. 1132. (Here we should expect εἴη.)

REMARK. The same apodosis, in either the Indicative or Optative, may take one protasis in the Indicative referring to present or past time, and another in the Optative referring to a supposed future case. E. g.

Έγὼ οὖν δεινὰ ἄν εἶην εἰργασμένος, εἶ, ὅτε μέν με οἱ ἄρχοντες ἔταττον, τότε μὲν ἔ μενον, τοῦ δὲ θεοῦ τάττοντος, λίποιμι τὴν τάξιν, I should therefore (prove to) have behaved outrageously, if when the state authorities stationed me I stood my ground, but if now when God stations me I should desert my post. Plat. Apol. 28 E. (Here the combination of the two acts is the future condition on which the apodosis depends.) Ἐπεύχομαι πᾶτι τούτοις, εἰ ἀληθῆ πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἶποιμι καὶ εἶπον καὶ τότ εὐθὺς ἐν τῷ δήμῳ, εὐτυχίαν μοι δοῦναι, i. e. if I should speak the truth and did speak it then, &c. DEM. Cor. 274, 28. Εἰ δὲ μήτ ἔστι μήτε ἢ ν μήτ ἀν εἰπεῖν ἔχοι μηδείς μηδέπω καὶ τήμερον, τί τὸν σύμβουλον ἐχρῆν ποιεῖν; but if there neither is nor was (any such thing), and if no man yet even at this day could possibly tell of any, what ought the statesman to have done (which was not done)? Ib. 291, 28. (See § 50, 2, N. 2, and § 49, 2, N. 3.)

§ 55. 1. Two or more protases, not co-ordinate, may belong to one apodosis. E. g.

Καὶ γὰρ ἃν οὖτός τι πάθη, ταχέως ὑμεῖς ἔτερον Φίλιππον ποιήσετε, ἄνπερ οὖτω προσέχητε τοῖς πράγμασι τὰν νοῦν. DEM. Phil. I, 43, 12. Εἰ δ' ἢμεν νέοι δὶς καὶ γέροντες, εἴ τις ἐξημάρτανε, διπλοῦ βίου λαχόντες ἐξωρθούμεθ' ἄν. Εὐπ. Suppl. 1084. Εἴ τίς σε ἀνέροιτο τοῦτο, τὶ ἐστι σχῆμα; εὶ αὐτῷ εἶπες ὅτι στρογγυλότης, εἴ σοι εἰπεν ἄπερ ἐγὼ, εἶπες δήπου ἃν ὅτι σχῆμά τι. PLAT. Men. 74 B.

2. It sometimes happens, that the apodosis is itself in a dependent sentence (as in a final clause), which determines its mood without reference to the preceding rules. In this case, if the leading verb is in a secondary tense, so that the apodosis takes the Optative, the protasis also takes the Optative by the general rule (§ 31, 1), even if it would otherwise have the Subjunctive. E. g.

Ταῦτα δ' εἶπεν, τν' εἰ μὲν καὶ νῦν προσδοκήσαιμι αὐτὸν ἐρεῖν, ἀπολογούμενος περὶ αὐτῶν διατρίβοιμι, εἰ δὲ παραλίποιμι, νῦν αὐτὸς εἴποι, and he said this, in order that, if on the one hand I should still expect him to tell it, I should waste time about it in my defence; but if on the other hand I should omit it, he might now rell it

himself. Dem. Aph. I, 830, 8. (If a primary tense stood for elnev, we should have, e. g. ταῦτα λέγει, εν έαν μεν προσδοκήσω αὐτον έρειν, διατρίβω, έὰν δὲ παραλίπω, νῦν εἴπη.)

For the forms assumed by such sentences when constructed on the principle of indirect discourse, see § 77, 1.

After many verbs expressing wonder, delight, contentment, indignation, disappointment, and similar ideas, a protasis with et may be used where a causal sentence would seem more natural. Such verbs are especially θαυμάζω, αἰσχύνομαι, ἀγαπάω, and ἀγανα-

Θαυμάζω δ' έγωγε εὶ μηδεὶς ὑμῶν μήτ' ἐνθυμεῖται μήτ' ὀργίζεται, δρῶν, κ.τ.λ., I wonder that no one of you is either concerned or angry, when he sees, &c. (lit. if no one is either concerned or angry, I wonder).

Dem. Phil. I, 52, 17. (See Rem. below.) 'Αλλ' ἐκεῖνο θαυμάζω, εἰ
Λακεδαιμονίοις μέν ποτε ἀντήρατε, νυνὶ δ' ὀκνεῖτε ἐξιέναι καὶ μέλλετε είσφέρειν, but I wonder at this, that you once opposed the Lacedaemonians, but now are unwilling, &c. Id. Ol. II, 25, 2. (The literal meaning is, if (it is true that) you once opposed, &c., then I wonder.) Οὐκ ἀγαπῷ εἰ μὴ δίκην ἔδωκεν, ἀλλ' εἰ μὴ καὶ χρυσῷ στεφάνῷ στεφανωθήσεται άγανακτεί, he is not content if he was not punished; but if he is not also to be crowned with a golden crown, he is indignant. AESCHIN. Cor. § 147. (Here the former protasis belongs under § 49, 1, and the latter under § 49, 1, N. 3.)

Καὶ ως άληθως άγανακτω, εὶ ούτωσὶ α νοω μὴ οίός τ' εἰμὶ εἰπείν, I am indignant that (or if) I am not able, &c. Plat. Lach. 194 A. Οὐ δὴ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν, εἰ στρατευόμενος καὶ πονῶν ἐκείνος αὐτὸς ύμων μελλόντων καὶ ψηφιζομένων καὶ πυνθανομένων περιγίγνεται, it is no wonder that he gets the advantage of you, &c. Dem. Ol. II, 24, 23. Μηδὲ μέντοι τοῦτο μεῖον δόξητε ἔχειν, εἰ οἱ Κυρεῖοι πρόσθεν σὺν ἡμίν ταττόμενοι νῦν ἀφεστήκασιν, i. e. do not be discontented, if (or that) the Cyraeans have now withdrawn. XEN. An. III, 2, 17.

These verbs may also be followed by one and a causal sentence, as in Plat. Theaet. 142 A, έθαύμαζον ὅτι οὐχ οἶός τ' ἢ εύρεῖν. The construction with el gives a milder or more polite form of expression, putting the object of the wonder, &c. into the form of a supposition. instead of stating it as a fact, as we should do in English. The forms of protasis quoted above belong under § 49, 1. For the form sometimes assumed by these sentences on the principle of indirect dis course, see § 77, 1, c.

REMARK. This construction must not be mistaken for that in which el is used in the sense of whether, to introduce an indirect question; as, ἐπύθετο εὶ σὺ παρείης, he asked whether you were present For this see § 68, 3, and § 70.

§ 57. The apodosis is sometimes introduced by the conjunction $\delta \epsilon$, as if the apodosis formed a sentence co-ordinate with the protasis, instead of being (as it is) the leading sentence. This is especially common in Homer and Herodotus, and rare in Attic prose. It occurs when the apodosis is to be emphatically opposed to the protasis. Instead of $\delta \epsilon$ we sometimes find $\delta \lambda \lambda \delta$ or $\delta \epsilon$. E. g.

Εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώωσιν, ἐγὼ δ έ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι, but if they do not give it up, then I will take it myself. II. I, 137. ᾿Αλλά is found in II. I, 82, quoted \S 51, N. 2. Εἴ περ γάρ τ' ἄλλοι γε περικτεινώμεθα πάντες νηυσὶν ἐπ' ᾿Αργείων, σοὶ δ' οὐ δέος ἔστ' ἀπολέσθαι. II. ΧΙΙ, 245. Εἰ δὲ θανόντων περ καταλήθοντ' εἰν ᾿Αίδαο, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ κεῖθι φίλου μεμνήσομ' ἐταίρου. II. ΧΧΙΙ, 389. Εἰ ὑμῖν ἐστι τοῦτο μὴ δυνατὸν ποιῆσαι, ὑμέες δ ὲ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου ἡμῖν ἔζεσθε. ΗDT. VIII, 22. ᾿Αλλ' εἰ μηδὲ τοῦτο βούλει ἀποκρίνασθαι, σὺ δὲ τοὖντεῦθεν λέγε. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. V, 5, 21.

This ố in apodosis cannot be expressed in English; as our adverbs then, yet, still, &c., necessarily fail to give the force of the Greek

δέ, which is always a conjunction.

REMARK. $\Delta \epsilon$ may be used in the same way to introduce the sentence upon which a relative clause depends. Lee Remark before § 65.

SECTION III.

RELATIVE AND TEMPORAL SENTENCES.

- § 58. 1. Relative sentences may be introduced not only by relative pronouns and pronominal adjectives, but also by relative adverbs of time, place, or manner. They include therefore all temporal clauses, except those introduced by $\pi\rho i\nu$ and other particles meaning until, which are treated separately (§ 66 and § 67).
- 2. Relative sentences may be divided into two classes:—

First, those in which the antecedent of the relative is definite; that is, in which the relative pronouns refer to definite persons or things, and the relative adverbs to definite points of time, place, &c.

Secondly, those in which the antecedent is indefinite, that is, in which no such definite persons, things, times, or places are referred to.

Both the definite and the indefinite antecedent may

be either expressed or understood. E. g.

(Definite Antecedents). Taîra â $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ $\delta\rho\hat{a}s$, you see these things which I have; or â $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ $\delta\rho\hat{a}s$. "Ore $\hat{\epsilon}\beta\omega\hat{\lambda}\epsilon\tau\sigma$ $\hat{\eta}\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$, (once) when he wished, he came.

(Indefinite Antecedents.) Πάντα ἃ ἃν βούλωνται εξουσιν, they will have everything which they may want; or ἃ ἃν βούλωνται εξουσιν, they will have whatever they may want. Οτε βούλοιτο ἤρχετο, whenever he wished, he came.

3. When the antecedent is indefinite, the negative particle of the relative clause is $\mu\dot{\eta}$; when the antecedent is definite, $o\dot{v}$ is regularly used, unless the general construction requires $\mu\dot{\eta}$, as in *prohibitions*, wishes, &c. (See § 59, Note 1.)

A. Relative with a Definite Antecedent.

§ 59. When the relative refers to a definite antecedent, expressed or understood, it has no effect upon the mood of the following verb; and it therefore takes the Indicative, unless the general sense of the passage requires some other construction. E. g.

Λέγω α οίδα. Λέγω α ήκουσα. Λέξω α ἀκήκοα. ελεξαν α ήκουσαν. Πάντα λέγει α γενήσεται. Πράσσουσιν α βούλονται (or ως βούλονται), they are doing what they please. (On the other hand, πράσσουσιν α αν βούλωνται (or ως αν βούλωνται), they always do whatever they please; the antecedent being indefinite.) Λέγω α οὐκ

άγνοω, I am saying that of which I am not ignorant.

'Αλλ' ὅτε δὴ ὁ' ἐκ τοῖο δυωδεκάτη γένετ' ἡως, καὶ τότε δὴ πρὸς Ολυμπον ισαν θεοὶ αἰἐν ἐόντες. Π. Ι, 493. Τίς ἔσθ ὁ χῶρος δῆτ', ἐν ῷ βεβήκαμεν. Soph. O. C. 52. "Εως ἐστὶ καιρὸς, ἀντιλάβεσθε τῶν πραγμάτων, i. e. now, while there is an opportunity, &c. Dem. Ol. I, 15, 6. (If the exhortation had been general, he might have said ἔως ἀν ἢ καιρός, (on all occasions) so long as there is an opportunity, & 62.) 'Ο δὲ ἀναβὰς, ἔως μὲν βάσιμα ἢν, ἐπὶ τοῦ ἴππου ἦγεν ἐπεὶ δὲ ἄβατα ἢν, καταλιπών τὸν ἵππον ἔσπευδε πεζῷ. Χεν. Απ. ΗΙ, 4, 49. So Π. Ι, 193, ἔως ὥρμαινε. Οἴπερ δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀποβαινόντων τὸ πλέον τῆς αἰτίας ἔξομεν, οὖτοι καὶ καθ' ἡσυχίαν τι αὐτῶν προίδωμεν, we

who are to bear the greater part of the blame, &c. Thuc. I, 83. Then do not be are to bear the greater part of the blame, &c. Thuc. I, 83. Then do not be seen a didaken. Dem. Aph. I, 814, 4. (Here enterden refers to a particular point, at which he intends to begin.) Compare the first example under Note 1. He had not to begin. Compare the first example under Note 1. He had not to be a didaken. Suppose the first example under Note 1. He had not to be a didaken. Suppose the first example under Note 1. He had not to be a didaken. When you shall impel me, &c. II. I, 518. (Here are refers to some time conceived as definite by the speaker; whereas or a exception, whenever she shall provoke me, is indefinite, and belongs under § 61, 3.) Not or a source of the didaken. The too had a source où houerns è e e ee, the state of the didaken. Od. XVIII, 272.

NOTE 1. When the sense requires it, these clauses admit all the constructions allowed in independent sentences. E. g.

"Αρξομαι δ' ἐντεῦθεν δθεν καὶ ὑμεῖς ῥᾶστ' ἄν μάθοιτε κἀγὼ τάχιστ' ἄν διδάξαιμι. Dem. Aph. III, 846, 15. (Here the relative clause contains an apodosis with ἄν, with a protasis εἰ ἀρξαίμην implied. This must not be confounded with the use of the Optative without ἄν, in the other class of relative sentences. See § 61, 4.) Νῦν δὲ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐποίησεν, ἐν ἄ τὐν δῆμον ἐτίμη σεν ἄν, but he did not do this, in which he would have honored the people (if he had done it). Id. Mid. 536, 25. Εἰς καλὸν ὑμῦν "Ανυτος ἄδε παρεκαθέζετο, ῷ μεταδῶμεν τῆς ζητήσεως. Plat. Men. 89 Ε. (Subjunctive in an exhortation.) Οὔκουν ἄξιον τοῖς τῶν κατηγόρων λόγοις πιστεῦσαι μᾶλλον ἡ τοῖς ἔργοις καὶ τῷ χρόνῳ, ὃν ὑμεῖς σαφέστατον ἔλεγχον τοῦ ἀληθοῦς νομίσατε. Lys. de Bon. Arist. p. 157, § 61. (Here the Imperative νομίσατε is used in a sort of exclamation after ὅν, where στοιπατὶγ δεῖ νομίσαι would be used.) "Αν γὰρ ἀποφύγη με οὖτος, ὁ μὴ γένοιτο, τὴν ἐπωβελίαν ὀφλήσω. Dem. Aph. I, 834, 25. (Optative in a wish.) "Εσσεται ἦμαρ ὅτ' ἄν ποτ' ὁλώλη "Ίλιος ἱρή, a day will come when sacred Ilium will fall. II. VI, 448. (Here δλώλη ἄν is used like a Future Indicative, § 87, Note; and the antecedent of ὅτε is definite. If ἄν belonged to ὅτε, the clause would be a protasis, meaning when Ilium shall fall, a day will come.)

NOTE 2. The relative may be used to express a purpose (§ 65, 1), or in a causal sense (§ 65, 4). The antecedent may then be either definite or indefinite.

B. Relative with an Indefinite Antecedent.

§ 60. 1. When the relative refers to an *indefinite* antecedent, expressed or understood, the action of its verb is not stated absolutely as a definite fact, but conditionally as a *supposed case*; and such a relative sentence has many of the essential qualities of a conditional sentence.

Thus, when we say α νομίζει ταῦτα λέγει, he is saying what he (actually) thinks, or à ἐνόμιζε ταῦτα ἔλεγεν, he was saying what he thought, the actions of νομίζει and ενόμιζε are stated as actual facts, occurring at definite times; but when we say a an vouicy (ταύτα) λέγει, he (always) says whatever he thinks, or à νομίζοι (ταῦτα) ἔλεγεν, he (always) said whatever he happened to be thinking, νομίζη and νομίζοι do not state any such definite facts, but rather what some one may think (or may have thought) on any occasion on which he is (or was) in the habit of speaking. So, when we say à vo-ile raîta délei, he will say what he (now) thinks, νομίζει denotes a fact; but when we say à αν νομίζη λέξει. he will say whatever he happens to be (then) thinking, vouis denotes merely a case supposed in the future. Again, - to take the case in which the distinction is most liable to be overlooked, - when we say å οὐκ οἶδα οὐκ οἴομαι εἰδέναι, what I do not know, I do not think that I know, our oida, as before, denotes a simple fact, and its object, a, has a definite antecedent; but when Socrates says à μη οίδα οὐδὲ οἴομαι εἰδέναι, the meaning is if there are any things which I do not know, I do not even think that I know them. In sentences like this, unless a negative is used ($\mu\eta$ being the sign of an indefinite, or of a definite antecedent), it is often difficult to decide whether the antecedent is definite or indefinite: thus å οίδα οίομαι είδεναι may mean either what I (actually) know, I think that I know, or if there is anything which I know, I think that I know it.

The analogy of these indefinite relative clauses to conditional sentences will be seen at once. The following examples will make this clearer: --

"Ο τι βούλεται δώσω, I will give him whatever he (now) wishes. Εἴ τι βούλεται, δώσω, if he wishes anything, I will give it. (§ 49, 1.)

"Ο τι αν βούληται, δώσω, I will give him whatever he shall wish. 'Εάντι βουληται, δώσω, if he shall wish anything, I will give it.

(§ 50, 1.)
"Ο τι βούλοιτο δοίην αν, I should give him whatever he might wish. Εί τι βούλοιτο, δοίην αν, if he should wish anything, I should give it. (§ 50, 2.)

[&]quot;Ο τι έβούλετο έδωκα αν, I should have given him whatever he haa wished. "Ο τι μή έγένετο οὐκ αν είπον, I should not have told what had not happened. Εἴ τι ἐβούλετο, ἔδωκα ἄν, if he had wished any-hing, I should have given it. Εἴ τι μὴ ἐγένετο, οὐκ αν εἶπον, if anything had not happened, I should not have told it. (§ 49, 2.)

Ο τι αν βούληται δίδωμι, I (always) give him whatever he wishes. Ο τι βούλοιτο έδίδουν, I always gave him whatever he wished. Εαν τι βούληται, δίδωμι, if he ever wishes anything, I (always) give it. Εἴ τι βούλοιτο, έδίδουν, if he ever wished anything, I (always) gave it. (§ 51.)

- 2. The relative with an indefinite antecedent may therefore be called the *conditional relative*, and the clause in which it stands may be called the *protasis* (like clauses with $\epsilon \hat{\iota}$ or $\hat{\epsilon} \acute{a} \nu$), and the antecedent clause may be called the *apodosis*.
- 3. The particle $\tilde{a}\nu$ (Epic $\kappa \epsilon$) is regularly joined with all relative words, when they are followed by the Subjunctive. The particle here (as always in protasis) is joined to the relative, never to the verb. (See § 38, 1, and § 47, 2.)

Note. With $\delta \tau \epsilon$, $\delta \pi \delta \tau \epsilon$, $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \ell$, and $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \eta$, $\delta \nu$ coalesces, forming $\delta \tau a \nu$, $\delta \pi \delta \tau a \nu$, $\epsilon \pi \delta \nu$ or $\epsilon \pi \eta \nu$ (Ionic $\epsilon \pi \epsilon a \nu$), and $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \delta a \nu$. In Homer, where $\kappa \epsilon$ is generally used for $\delta \nu$, we have $\delta \tau \epsilon \kappa \epsilon$, &c. (like $\epsilon \ell \kappa \epsilon$), where in Attic we have $\delta \tau a \nu$, &c. ' $E \pi \eta \nu$, however, occurs often in Homer.

REMARK. The classification of common conditional sentences, given in § 48, applies equally to conditional relative sentences. The distinction between those containing general suppositions (§ 62) and the corresponding forms containing particular suppositions (§ 61, 1) is especially important.

- § 61. We have *four* forms of the conditional relative sentence which correspond to the four forms of ordinary protasis (§ 49, 1, 2, and § 50, 1, 2):—
- 1. When the relative clause refers to a definite act in the *present* or the *past*, and no opinion of the speaker is implied as to the truth of the supposition, the verb is put in one of the present or past tenses of the Indicative. (§ 49, 1.)

The antecedent clause can have any form allowed in an apodosis (§ 49, 1, Note 1). E. g.

Α μη οίδα, οὐδὲ οἴομαι εἰδέναι (like εἴ τινα μη οίδα). Plat. Apol.

21 D. (See above, § 60, 1.) Χρήσθων ὅ τι βούλονται, let them deal with me as they please (i. e. εί τι βούλονται). ARIST. Nub. 439. Επίσταμαι όραν θ' ά δει με, κούχ όραν ά μη πρέπει, I know how to see anything which I ought to see, and not to see anything which I ought not. Eur. Ino Fr. 417. (A δεί is nearly equivalent to εί τινα δεί, and â μη πρέπει to εί τινα μη πρέπει.) Τους πλείστους ενθαπερ έπεσον έκάστους έθαψαν ους δε μή ευρισκον, κενοτάφιον αυτοίς εποίησαν, i. e. they raised a cenotaph for any of them whom they did not find (like εί τινας μη εύρισκον). ΧΕΝ. Απ. VI, 4, 9. Τί γάρ; ὅστις δαπανηρὸς ῶν μὴ αὐτάρκης ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ τῶν πλησίον δείται, καὶ λαμβάνων μη δύναται ἀποδιδόναι, μη λαμβάνων δὲ τὸν μη διδόντα μισεί, οὐ δοκεί σοι καὶ οὖτος χαλεπὸς φίλος είναι; (i. e. supposing a case, εί τις μη αὐτάρκης ἐστὶν, κ. τ. λ.). Id. Mem. II, 6, 2. So ñτις μηδαμού ξυμμαχεί, THUC. I, 35. "Α τις μη προσεδόκησεν, οὐδὲ φυλάξασθαι ἐγχωρεί, there is no opportunity to guard against what we did not expect (like εί τινα μη προσεδόκησε τις). ANTIPHON. p. 131, 36. § 19. Είς τὰ πλοία τούς τε ἀσθενούντας ενεβίβασαν καὶ τῶν σκευῶν ὅσα μὴ ἀνάγκη ἢν ἔχειν (like εἴ τινα τῶν σκευῶν μὴ ἀνάγκη ην έχειν), i. e. any of it which they did not need. XEN. An. V. 3, 1. Ανθρώπους διέφθειρεν (ή θάλασσα) ύσοι μη εδύναντο φθηναι προς τὰ μετέωρα ἀναδραμόντες, i. e. if any were unable to escape soon enough to the high land, so many the sea destroyed. THUC. III, 89. Ois were αιρεσις γεγένηται τάλλα εὐτυχοῦσι, πολλή άνοια πολεμήσαι : εἰ δ' avayκαιον ήν, κ.τ.λ., for any who have had the choice given them, while they are prosperous in other respects, it is great folly to go to war (i. e. εί τισιν αίρεσις γεγένηται). ΤΠΟΟ. ΙΙ, 61. Πάντες ίσμεν Χαβρίαν ούτε τύπτοντα οὐθ' ἀρπάζοντα τὸν στέφανον οῦθ' ὅλως προσιόνθ' ὅποι μή προσηκεν αὐτώ, nor going anywhere at all where it was not lawful for him (i. e. εί ποι μη προσήκεν). DEM. Mid. 535, 15. Πως οὐν οί άγαθοι τοις άγαθοις φίλοι έσονται, οι μήτε απόντες ποθεινοι άλλήλοις μήτε παρόντες χρείαν αυτών έχουσι; (ί. ε. εί μή . . . έχουσι). PLAT. Lys. 215 B. Νικώη δ' ό τι πασιν υμίν μέλλει συνοίσειν (i. e. εί τι μέλλει), may any plan prevail which will benefit you all. Dem. Phil. I, 55. 7. So Soph. Ant. 375, ôs τάδ' ἔρδει.

Note. Care must be taken here (as in conditional sentences, § 49, 1, Note 2), not to include under this class the general suppositions of § 62, which require the Subjunctive or Optative. On the other hand, the examples falling under § 62, Note 1, in which the Indicative is allowed, might properly be placed here, as they state a general supposition for emphasis as if it were a particular one (§ 5° Note 3). See also § 61, 3, Note.

2. When a relative clause, referring to the present or the past, implies that the condition which it expresses is not or was not fulfilled (like a protasis of the form § 49, 2), its verb is put in a secondary tense of the In dicative.

The ancecedent clause also contains a secondary tense of the Indicative, implying the non-fulfilment of a condition, which may be in an apodosis with $\tilde{a}\nu$ or a protasis (§ 49, 2), or in an expression of a wish (§ 83). E. g.

"A μη έβούλετο δοῦναι, οὐκ ἃν ἔδωκεν, he would not have given what he had not wished to give (i. e. εί τινα μη έβούλετο δοῦναι, οὐκ αν έδωκεν). Οὔτε γαρ αν αντοι ἐπεχειρούμεν πράττειν α μὴ ἡπιστάμεθα, οὖτε τοις ἄλλοις ἐπετρέπομεν, ὧν ἥρχομεν, ἄλλο τι πράττειν ἣ ἦ τι πράττοντες ὀρθώς ἔμελλον πράξειν 'τοῦτο δ' ἦν ἄν, οὖ ἐπιστήμην είχον, for (if that were so) we should not be undertaking (as we are) to do things which we did not understand, nor should we permit any others whom we were ruling to do anything else than what they were likely to do properly; and this would be whatever they had knowledge of. Plat. Charm. 171 E. (Here å μη ηπιστάμεθα = εί τινα μη ηπιστάμεθα, if there were any things which we did not know, - δυ $\eta \rho \chi o \mu \epsilon \nu = \epsilon \ddot{i} \tau \iota \nu \omega \nu \ \eta \rho \chi o \mu \epsilon \nu = \ddot{o} \tau \iota \ \ddot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu = \epsilon \ddot{i} \tau \iota \ \ddot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu = and o \ddot{b}$ $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \mu \eta \nu \epsilon i \chi \sigma \nu = \epsilon i \tau \iota \nu \sigma \sigma \epsilon i \chi \sigma \nu$. It is implied that none of the cases here supposed ever actually arose, as the whole passage refers to an unfulfilled condition expressed in the preceding sentence.) El $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ οίκοι είχον εκαστοι τὰς δίκας, τούτους ἃν ἀπώλλυσαν οἵτινες Φίλοι μάλιστα ήσαν 'Αθηναίων τῷ δήμφ, if each had their trials at home, they would ruin any who were especially friendly, &c. XEN. Rep. Athen. (Here of tives $\hat{\eta} \sigma a \nu$, $= \epsilon \hat{l} \tau i \nu \epsilon s \hat{\eta} \sigma a \nu$, forms a second protasis to the apodosis ἀπώλλυσαν ἄν. See § 55, 1.)

El ξένος ἐτύγχανον ὧν, ξυνεγιγνώσκετε δήπου ἄν μοι, εl ἐν ἐκείνη τῆ φωνῆ τε καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ ἔλεγον ἐν οἶσπερ ἐτεθράμμην, if I happened to be a foreigner, you would surely pardon me, if I were (now) addressing you in both the language and the manner in which I had been brought up. Plat. Apol. 17 D. 'Ως δη ἔγωγ' ὅφελον μάκαρός νύ τεμμεναι υίὸς ἀνέρος, δν κτεάτεσσιν ἑοῖς ἔπι γῆρας ἔτετμεν, O that I were the son of some fortunate man, whom old age had found upon his own estate (i. e. if old age had found any such man, would that I had

been his son). Od. I, 217.

REMARK. All examples of this form fall equally well under the general rule for assimilation, § 64, 2.

3. When the relative clause refers distinctly and vivilly to the future (like a protasis of the form § 50, 1),

and the verb of the antecedent clause also refers to the future, the relative is joined with $\tilde{a}\nu$ (or $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}$) and followed by the Subjunctive. E. g.

Τάων ην κ' έθ έλωμι φίλην ποιήσομ' ἄκοιτιν (like εί κέ τινα έθέλωμι), whomsoever of these I may wish I shall make my wife. II. IX, 397. Έκ γὰρ 'Ορέσταο τίσις ἔσσεται 'Ατρείδαο, ὁππότ' αν ἡβήση τε καὶ ης ιμείρεται ains, i. e. vengeance will come from Orestes, when he shall grow up, &c. (like έάν ποτε ήβήση). Od. I, 40. Τότε δ' αὐτε μαχήσεται, όππότε κέν μιν θυμός ένὶ στήθεσσιν ανώγη καὶ θεός όρση. Il. IX, 702. 'Αλλ' άγεθ', ως αν έγων είπω, πειθώμεθα πάντες, let us obey as I may direct, i. e. if I give any direction (ἐάν πως εἴπω), let us obey it. II. II, 139. 'Ημείς αὐτ' ἀλόχους τε Φίλας καὶ νήπια τέκνα άξομεν εν νήεσσιν, επην πτολίεθρον ελωμεν, when we shall have taken the city. II. IV. 238. So εὖτ ἀν πίπτωσιν, II. I, 242. Οὐκοῦν, ὅταν δὴ μὴ σθένω, πεπαύσομαι, therefore, when I shall have no more strength, I will cease. SOPH. Ant. 91. Ταῦτα, ἐπειδὰν περὶ τοῦ γένους είπω, έρω, I will speak of this, when I shall have spoken about my birth. Dem. Eubul. 1303, 25. (See § 20, Note 1.) Ἐπειδάν διαπράξωμαι ά δέομαι, ήξω. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Η, 3, 29. Τίνα οἴεσθε αὐτὴν ψυχὴν έξειν, όταν έμε ίδη των πατρώων απεστερημένον; what feelings do you think she will have, when (or if at any time) she shall see me, &c.? Dem. Aph. II, 842, 16. Τούτων δε 'Αθηναίους φημί δείν είναι πεντακοσίους, έξ ης αν τινος υμίν ηλικίας καλώς έχειν δοκ η, from whatever age it shall seem good to you to take them (i. e. if from any particular age, &c.) Id. Phil. I, 45, 27. Των πραγμάτων τους βουλευομένους (ἡγεῖσθαι δεῖ), ĩva â ấν ἐκείνοις δοκῆ ταὖτα πράττηται, in order that whatever shall seem good to them shall be done. Ib. 51, 19. Οῦ μοι Φόβου μέλαθρον έλπὶς έμπατείν, εως αν αίθη πύρ ἐφ' έστίας έμης Αίνισθος, so long as he shall kindle fire, &c. AESCH. Agam. 1435.

Note. The Future Indicative is rarely, if ever, used in conditional relative clauses, as in common protasis (§ 50, 1, Note 1), in the place of the Subjunctive; as it would generally be ambiguous, appearing as if the antecedent were definite. Toou Bounhouta, Thuc. 1, 22, is perhaps to be explained in this way. See XEM. Cyr. I, 5, 13. In such examples as $\frac{1}{2}\mu \eta \tau is a \dot{v} \tau \dot{o} s \pi a \rho \dot{e} \sigma \tau a \iota$, unless he was to be present himself, the Future is used as it is in the form of protasis explained § 49, 1, N. 3.

4. When the relative clause refers to the future less distinctly and vividly (like a protasis of the form § 50, 2), and the antecedent clause contains an Optative referring to the future, the relative is followed by the Optative (without $\tilde{a}\nu$).

The Optative in the antecedent clause may be in an

apodosis with $\tilde{a}\nu$ or a protasis (§ 50, 2), in an expression of a wish (§ 82), or in a final clause. E. g.

Μάλα κεν θρασυκάρδιος είη, δε τότε γηθήσειεν ίδων πόνον οὐδ ἀκάχοιτο (i. e. εί τις γηθήσειε, μάλα κεν θρασυκάρδιος είη), any one who should then rejoice would be very stout-hearted. II. XIII, 343 So Il. VI, 329 and 521; XIV, 247: ARIST. Nub. 1250. Oùr âv oùv θρέψαις άνδρα, όστις έθέλοι τε καὶ δύναιτο σοῦ ἀπερύκειν τοὺς έπιχειρούντας άδικείν σε; would you not support any man who shoula be both willing and able, &c.? XEN. Mem. II, 9, 2. Πεινών φάγοι αν όπότε βούλοιτο, when he is hungry, he would eat whenever he might wish (like εί ποτε βούλοιτο). Ib. II, 1, 18. So Mem. I, 5, 4; I, 7, 3; ΙΫ, 2, 20. Πως οὖν ὰν εἰδείης περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματος, οὖ παντάπασιν ἄπειρος είης; how then could you know about that thing of which you had no experience at all? PLAT. Men. 92 C. Aρ' αν ήγοιο ταῦτα σὰ είναι, ἄ σοι έξείη καὶ ἀποδόσθαι καὶ δοῦναι καὶ θῦσαι ότφ βούλοιο θεων; Id. Euthyd. 302 A. Τί αν παθείν (δύναιτο), δ μὴ καὶ ὑφ' αὐτοῦ πάθοι; what could he suffer, unless he should suffer it also from himself? (i. e. εἰ μὴ πάθοι). Plat. Lys. 214 E. °O δὲ μη άγαπ ώη, οὐδ' ἄν φιλοῖ (i. e. έἴ τι μη άγαπώη, οὐδ' ἄν φιλοῖ τοῦτο). Ib. 215 B. "Οσω δὲ πρεσβύτερος γίγνοιτο, μαλλον ἀεὶ ἀσπάζοιτο την (χρήματα), the older he should grow, the more he would always cling to il (i. e. εί τι πρεσβύτερος γίγνοιτο, τόσφ μᾶλλον ἀσπάζοιτο ἄν). Plat. Rep. VIII, 549 B. So III, 412 D; VIII, 557 B. Φήσομεν μηδέποτε μηδέν αν μείζον μηδέ έλαττον γενέσθαι, έως ίσον είη αὐτὸ έαυτώ, so long as it should remain equal to itself. Plat. Theaet.

Εὶ δὲ βούλοιο τῶν φίλων τινὰ προτρέψασθαι ὁπότε ἀποδημοίης ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῶν σῶν, τί αν ποιοίης; ΧΕΝ. ΜεΜ. Π, 3, 12. Εἰκότως αν καὶ παρὰ θεῶν πρακτικώτερος εἴη, ὅστις μὴ ὁπότε ἐν ἀπόροις εἴη τότε κολακεύοι, ἀλλὶ ὅτε τὰ ἄριστα πράττοι τότε μάλιστα τῶν θεῶν μεμνῷτο. Id. Cyr. I, 6, 3. ʿΩς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος, ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ρέζοι, Ο that any other man might likewise perish who should do the like (i. e. εἴ τις τοιαῦτα ρέζοι). Od. I, 47. Ἐγίρνωσκε δεῖν τοὺς ὑπηρέτας τοῦτο ἀσκεῖν, ὡς πάντα νομίζοιεν πρέπειν αὐτοῖς πράττειν ὅσα

ό ἄρχων προστάττοι. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. II, I, 31.

Remark. All these examples fall also under the general rule for assimilation, \S 64, 1.

§ 62. A conditional relative sentence (like a protasis, § 51) may express a general supposition. This happens when the verb of the antecedent clause denotes a customary or repeated action or a general truth, while the relative clause refers indefinitely to any one of a series or class of acts, and not to a definite act or a definite series of acts.

Here the Subjunctive with \hat{o}_s $\tilde{a}\nu$, $\tilde{o}\tau a\nu$, &c. is used after primary tenses, and the Optative (without $\tilde{a}\nu$) after secondary tenses. E. g.

Έχθρὸς γάρ μοι κείνος όμῶς 'Αίδαο πύλησιν, ὅς χ' ἔτερον μὲν κεύθη ένὶ φρεσὶν, ἄλλο δὲ εἴτη, for that man (i. e. any man) is hated by me like the very gates of Hades, who conceals one thing in his mind and speaks another. II. IX, 312. Νεμεσσώμαι γε μέν οὐδέν κλαίειν ος κε θάνησι βροτών και ποτμον ενίσπη, I am never at all indignant at weeping for any mortal who may die, &c. Od. IV, 195. Καὶ γὰρ συμμαχείν τούτοις εθέλουσιν απαντες, ους αν δρωσι παρεσκευασμένους, for all men are (always) willing to be allies to those whom they see prepared. DEM. Phil. I, 42, 1. Καίπερ των ανθρώπων, εν ώ μεν αν πολεμώσι, τον παρόντα (πόλεμον) αξι μέγιστον κρινόντων, although men always consider the present war the greatest, so long as they are engaged in it. ΤΗυς. Ι, 21. Πορεύονται τε γάρ αι άγελαι ή αν αὐτας εί θύνωσιν οι νομείς, νέμονταί τε χωρία έφ' όποια αν αὐτάς έφιωσιν, ἀπέχονταί τε ων αν αντάς απείργωσι και τοις καρποις έωσι τους νομέας χρησθαι ούτως όπως αν αύτοι βούλωνται άνθρωποι δε επ' οὐδένας μαλλον συνίστανται ή έπλ τούτους οθς αν αισθωνται άρχειν αυτών έπιχειρούντας. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 1, 2. Νομίζω προστάτου έργον είναι οίου δεί, ôs αν όρων τους φίλους έξαπατωμένους μη επιτρέπη, i. e. such as one ought always to be, who, &c. Id. Hell. II, 3, 51. Καταφρόνησις δε (εγγίγνεται), δε αν και γνώμη πιστεύη των έναντίων προέχειν, δ ήμιν υπάρχει. THUC. II, 62. (Here the 6 refers to all that precedes, as a definite antecedent.)

Οὐ μὲν γὰρ μεῖζόν κλέος ἀνέρος, ὅφρα κ' ἔŋσιν, ἢ ὅ τι ποσσίν τε ἔέξη καὶ χερσίν. Od. VIII, 147. ("Οφρα κ' ἔŋσιν, so long as he lives.) (Θεούς) παρατρωπῶσ ἀνθρωποι λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερεἡη καὶ ἀμάρτη. Π. ΙΧ, 500. "Ήμισυ γάρτ' ἀρετῆς ἀποαίντεν εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς ἀνέρος, εὖτ' ἄν μιν κατὰ δούλιον ἢμαρ ἔλησιν. Od. ΧVII, 322. Φιλέει δέ κως προσημαίνειν, εὖτ' ἀν μέλλη μεγάλα κακὰ ἢ πόλι ἢ ἔθνει ἔσεσθαι. HDT. VI, 27. Φεύγουσι γάρ τοι χοὶ θρασεῖς, ὅταν πέλας ἢδη τὸν "λιδην εἰσορῶσι τοῦ βίου. SOPH. Ant. 580. 'Ἡνίκ' ἀν δ' οἴκοι γένωνται, δρῶσιν οὐκ ἀνασχετά. ΑRIST. 580. 'Ἡνίκ' ἀν δ' οἴκοι γένωνται, δρῶσιν οὐκ ἀνασχετά. ΑRIST. ΤΗΟ ΙΙ, 34. 'Ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἡ ἐκφορὰ ἢ, λάρνακας ἄγουσυν ἄμαξαι. ΤΗΟ ΙΙ, 34. 'Ἐπειδὰν δὲ κρύψωσι γῆ, ἀνὴρ ἡρημένος ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως, δς ᾶν γνώμη τε δοκῆ μὴ ἀξύνετος εἰναι, λέγει ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἔπαινον τὸν πρέποντα. Ibid. "Εως ᾶν σώζηται τὸ σκάφος, τότε χρὴ προθύμους εἰναι ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἡ θάλαττα ὑπ ἐροχη, μάταιος ἡ σπουδή. DEM. Phil. III, 128, 22. So ἔστ' ἀν δείσωσιν, ΧΕΝ. Μem. III, 5, 6.

Οὔ τινα γὰρ τίεσκον ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων, οὐ κακὸν οὐδὲ μέν ἐσθλὸν, 3 τίς σφεας εἰσαφίκοιτο, i. e. they were never in the habit of honoring any one who came to them. Od. XXII, 414. Καὶ οὖς μὲν ἴδοι εὐτάκτως καὶ σιωπἢ ἰόντας, προσελαύνων αὐτοῖς τίνες τε εἶεν ἠρώτα, καὶ ἐπεὶ π ύ θοιτο ἐπήνει. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. V, 3. 55. (Here ἡρώτα and ἐπήνει denote the habit of Cyrus.) Καὶ τοῖς μὲν ᾿Αθηναίοις ηὕξετο τὸ ναυτικὸν ἀπὸ τῆς δαπάνης ἡν ἐκείνοι ξυμφέροιεν, αὐτοὶ δὲ, ὁπότε ἀπο στα ῖεν, ἀπαράσκευοι καὶ ἄπειροι ἐς τὸν πόλεμον καθίσταντο, and the Athenian

navy continued to increase from the money which these contributed, and they, whenever they revolted, always found themselves unprepared and

inexperienced for war. Thuc. I, 99.

'Επὶ Μοίριος βασιλέος, ὅκως ἔλθοι ὁ ποταμὸς ἐπ' ὀκτὼ πήχεας, ἄρδεσκε Αἴγνπτω τὴν ἔνερθε Μέμφιος, i. e. whenever the river rose. ΗΣΤ. ΙΙ, 13. Τιν δὲ χοῦν τὸν ἐκφορεόμενον, ὅκως γίνοιτο νὰξ. τὸν Τίγριν ἐξεφόρεον, i. e. they carried it away every night. Id. II. 150. Οἱ δε (Κᾶρες), ὅκως Μίνως δ ἐοιτο, ἐπλήρουν οἱ τὰς νέας. Id. I, 171. 'Επειδὴ δὲ ἀνοιχθείη, εἰσήειμεν παρὰ τὸν Σωκράτη, i. e. each morning, when the prison was opened, &c. Plat. Phaed. 59 D. Οτε ἔξω τοῦ δεινοῦ γ ἐνοιντο, πολλοὶ αὐτὸν ἀπέλειπον, many (always) left him, when they were out of danger. ΧΕΝ. An. II, 6, 12. (If ἐγένοντο had been used, the whole sentence would refer to a particular case in which many left him.)

REMARK. The gnomic Aorist, and the other gnomic and iterative tenses of § 30, can be used in the antecedent clause of these general propositions. The gnomic Aorist, as usual, is a primary tense. (See § 32, 2.) E. g.

"Os κε θεοῖς ἐπιπείθηται, μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ, whoever obeys the Gods, to him they are ready to listen. II. I, 218. "Οταν τις ὅσπερ οὖτος ἰσχύση, ἡ πρώτη πρόφασις ἄπαντα ἀνεχαίτισε καὶ διέλυσεν. Dem. Ol. II, 20, 27. 'Οπότε προσβλέψειέ τινας τῶν ἐν ταῖς τάξεσι, εἶπεν ἀν, ὁ ἄνδρες, κ.τ.λ., i. e. he used to say, &c. Χεπ. Cyr. VII, 1, 10. (See § 30, 2.) Οὕτ' ἄλλοτε πώποτε πρὸς χάριν εἰλόμην λέγειν, ὅ τι ἀν μὴ καὶ συνοίσειν πεπεισμένος ὧ, I have never on other occasions preferred to say anything in order to please, unless I have been convinced that it would also be for your advantage. Dem. Phil. I, 54, 27. (Here εἰλόμην is used in a sense approaching that of the gnomic Aorist, so as to be followed by a Subjunctive. See § 30, 1, N. 1.)

Note 1. The Indicative is sometimes used instead of the Subjunctive and Optative in relative sentences of this class. (See § 51, N. 3.) Here the speaker refers to one of the cases in which the event in question is liable to occur, as if it were the only case, instead of referring indefinitely to all possible cases alike (as when the Subjunctive or Optative is used). This use of the Indicative occurs especially after the indefinite relative sorie; as the idea of indefiniteness, which is usually expressed by the Subjunctive or Optative, is here sufficiently expressed by the relative itself. E. g.

Έχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς ᾿Αίδαο πύλησιν Γίγνεται, ὃς πενίη εἴκων ἀπατήλια βάζει. Od. XIV, 156. Compare this with the first example (II. IX, 312) under § 62 Έμοι γὰρ ὅστις πᾶσαν εὐθύνων πόλιν
Μὴ τῶν ἀρίστων ἄπτεται βουλευμάτων,
'Αλλ' ἐκ φόβου του γλῶσσαν ἐγκλείσας ἔχει,
Κάκιστος εἶναι νῦν τε καὶ πάλαι δοκεί
καὶ μείζον ὅστις ἀντὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ πάτρας
Φίλον ν ομίζει, τοῦτον οὐδαμοῦ λέγω. SOPH. Ant. 178.

(Here we might have had os αν μη απτηται, αλλ' . . . εχη, and

δs αν νομίζη, without any essential difference in meaning.)

Οἴτινες πρὸς τὰς ξυμφορὰς γνώμη μὲν ἤκιστα λυποῦνται, ἔργφ δὲ μάλιστα ἀντέχουσιν, οὖτοι καὶ πόλεων καὶ ἰδιωτῶν κράτιστοι εἰσιν. ΤΗΠΟ. ΙΙ, 64. So in the same chapter, ὅστις λαμβάνει. Ἔθαπτον τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὁπόσους ἐπελάμβανεν ἡ στρατιά, they continued to bury in the same way as many as the army took μη. ΧΕΝ. Απ. VI, 5, 6. (Here ἐπιλαμβάνοι might have been used.) Ὅστις δ' ἀφικνεῖτο τῶν παρὰ βασιλέως πρὸς αὐτὸν, πάντος ἀπεπέμπετο. Ιδ. Ι, 1, 5. Ὅπου δὲ χιλὸς σπάνιος πάνυ εἴη, αὐτὸς δ' ἐδ ὑνατο παρασκευάσασθαι, διαπέμπων ἐκέλευε τοὺτος φίλους ἵπποις ὲμβάλλειν τοῦτου. Ιδ. Ι, 9, 27. (In the last two examples there is some Ms. authority for the more regular ἀφικνοῖτο and δύναιτο.) See also An. I, 9, 13.

All these examples fall under the first class of conditional relative sentences, § 61, 1. So in common protasis, § 51, N. 3.

NOTE 2. The Greek generally uses the Indicative in relative clauses depending on *general negative* sentences, where in Latin a Subjunctive is more common. E. g.

Haρ' ἐμοὶ δὲ οὐδεὶς μισθοφορεῖ, ὅστις μὴ ἱκανός ἐστιν ἴσα πονεῖν ἐμοί, i e. no one who is not able (no one unless he is able), nemo qui non p ssit. Xen. Hell. VI, 1. 5. These sentences are regular protases, and belong under the rule of § 61, 1. (See Note 1.)

Note 3. (a.) In Homer, similes and comparisons are often expressed by the Subjunctive after ω_s , ω_s τ_{ϵ} , ω_s $\tilde{\sigma}_{\epsilon}$, $\tilde{\omega}_s$ $\tilde{\sigma}_{\epsilon}$ (seldom, ω_s \tilde{a}_{ν} , &c.), where we should expect the Present Indicative, which sometimes occurs. Besides the singular use of the Subjunctive in these expressions, the omission of \tilde{a}_{ν} or κ_{ϵ} is especially to be noticed. (See § 63, 1.) E. g.

Ως δε γυνή κλαίη σι φίλον πόσιν αμφιπεσούσα,

⁹Os τε έῆς πρόσθεν πόλιος λαών τε πεσησιν, •Ως 'Οδυσεύς ελεεινον ύπ' ὀφρύσι δάκρυον είβεν, Ulysses wept as a wife weeps, &c. Od. VIII, 523-531.

'Ως δ' ὅτ' ὀπωρινὸς Βορέης Φορέη σιν ἀκάνθας "Αμ πεδίον, πυκιναὶ δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλησιν ἔχονται,

Ως την αμ πέλαγος ανεμοι φέρον ένθα καὶ ένθα. Od. V, 328.

Οί δ', ως τ' άμητηρες έναντίοι αλλήλοισιν όγμον έλαύνωσιν, ως

Τρῶες καὶ ᾿Αχαιοὶ ἐπ᾽ ἀλλήλοισι θορόντες δήσυν. Π. ΧΙ, 67–71. See also Il. XII, 167-172.

(b.) In many cases the Subjunctive or the Present Indicative is followed by the gnomic Aorist in the same simile, the Aorist being merely a more vivid form of expression than the others. (See § 30, 1, Notes 2 and 3.) E. g.

'Ως δ' ὅτε καπνὸς Ιὰν εἰς οὐρανὸν εύρὺν Ἱκηται "Αστεος αἰθομένοιο, θεῶν δέ ἐ μῆνις ἀνῆκεν, Πὰσι δ' ἔθηκε πόνον, τολλοῖσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφῆκεν, 'Ως 'Αχιλεὺς Τρώεσσι πόνον καὶ κήδε' ἔθηκεν. Π. ΧΧΙ, 522.

'Ο δ' εν κονίησι χαμαὶ πέσεν, αἴγειρος δς,
'Η ρά τ' εν εἰαμενῆ ἔλεος μεγάλοιο πεφύκη
Λείη, ἀτάρ τέ οἱ ὅζοι ἐπ' ἀκροτάτη πεφύασιν
Τὴν μὲν θ' ἀρματοπηγὸς ἀνὴρ αἴθωνι σιδήρω
'Εξέταμ', ὄφρα ἵτυν κάμψη περικαλλεί δἰφρω'
'Η μέν τ' ἀζομένη κεῖται ποταμοῖο παρ ὅχθας '
Τοῖον ἄρ' ᾿Ανθεμίδην Σιμοείσιον ἐξενάριξεν
Αἴας διογενής. Π. ΙV, 482.

§ 63. 1. (a.) In Homer, the relatives (like ϵi) often take the Subjunctive without $\tilde{a}\nu$ or $\kappa \dot{\epsilon}$, the sense being apparently the same as when $\tilde{a}\nu$ is used. (§ 50, 1, N. 2.) E. g.

"Οττι μάλ' οὐ δηναιὸς, δς ἀθανάτοισι μάχηται. Π. V, 407.
'Ανθρώπους ἐφορᾶ, καὶ τίνυται ὅς τις ἀμάρτη. Od. ΧΙΙΙ, 214.
Ζεὺς δ' αὐτὸς νέμει ὅλβον 'Ολύμπιος ἀνθρώποισιν,
'Βσθλοῖς ἢδὲ κακοῖσιν, ὅπως ἐ θ έλησιν, ἐκάστφ. Od. VI, 188.
Οὐ μὴν σοὶ ποτε ἴσον ἔχω γέρας, ὁππότ' 'Αχαιοί
Τρώων ἐ κπέρσω σ' εὐναιόμενον πτολίεθρον. Π. Ι, 163.
Οῦ μὲν γάρ ποτέ φησι κακὸν πείσεσθαι ὀπίσσω,
"Όφρ' ἀρετὴν παρέχωσι θεοὶ καὶ γούνατ' ὀρώρη,
so long as the Gods shall supply valor, &c. Od. XVIII. 132.

(b.) The same omission of $\tilde{a}\nu$ is not uncommon in the Attion poets; and even in prose a few exceptional cases occur, if we follow the Mss. (§ 50, 1, N. 3). E. g.

Γέροντα δ' ὀρθοῦν φλαῦρον, δε νέος πέση. Soph. O. C. 395. Τῶν δὲ πημονῶν μάλιστα λυποῦσ' αἶ φανῶσ' αὐθαίρετοι. Id. O. T. 1231. Τοῦν γὰρ μήτε ἄστεα μήτε τείχεα ἢ ἐκτισμένα, . . . κῶς οὐκ ᾶν εἴησαν οὖτοι ἄμαχοι; Hdt. IV, 46. (See § 63, 4, α.) Ἐπιχώριον δν ἡμῖν οὖ μὲν βραχεῖς ἀρκῶσι μὴ πολλοῖς χρῆσθαι, it being our national habit not to use many words where few suffice. Thuc. IV, 17. (Yet the sentence continues, πλείοσι δὲ ἐν ῷ ἆν καιρὸς ἢ, κ.τ.λ.) See § θ6, 4, N.

2. The adverb $\tilde{a}\nu$ is sometimes used with the Optative or Indicative in conditional relative clauses, when the relative

clause is itself an apodosis, with a protasis expressed or implied. In Homer Ke with the Optative sometimes occurs where there is no apodosis, as in common protasis. (See § 50.2. N. 2, a, b.) E. g.

Έξ ων αν τις εὖ λέγων διαβάλλοι, ἐκ τούτων αὐτοὺς πείσεσθαι (¿on), he said that they would form their opinion upon any slanders which any good speaker might (if he pleased) chance to utter. THUC. VII, 48. But in Od. II, 54, ως κε δοίη ως κ' εθελοι, that he might give her to any one he pleased, ως κ' εθέλοι does not differ from the ordinary $\hat{\phi}$ $\hat{\epsilon}\theta\hat{\epsilon}\lambda\omega=\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}$ $\hat{\tau}\iota\nu\iota$ $\hat{\epsilon}\theta\hat{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$. In Dem. Phil. I, 41, 3, $\hat{\omega}\omega$ αν βούλοισθε is merely a conjectural emendation for οἶον αν βούλησθε, which is a regular example illustrating § 62. "Οντιν' αν ύμεις είς ταύτην την τάξιν κατεστήσατε, οὖτος τῶν ἴσων αἴτιος ἡν ἀν κακῶν ὅσωνπερ καὶ οὖτος, any one soever whom you might have appointed (if you had chosen) to this post would have been the cause of as great calamities as this man has been. Dem. F. L. 350, 3. (Without the av after ovriva, this would have been a regular example under § 61, 2, οντινα κατεστήσατε being equivalent to εί τινα άλλον κατεστήσατε, if you had appointed any one else (which you did not do). With the av, it is itself an apodosis with a suppressed protasis; unless we can suppose that the av was used, like ke in the Homeric example, without affecting the sense. See § 49, 2, N. 4.)

- 3. A conditional relative clause, like a common protasis, may depend upon an Infinitive or Participle (with or without $\tilde{a}\nu$), or upon a final clause. See the last three examples under § 61, 3. (Compare § 53; § 55, 2.)
- 4. The conditional relative clause may have a form different from that of its apodosis. This happens under the same circumstances as in common protasis. (See § 54.)
- (a.) An Indicative or Subjunctive in the relative clause may depend upon an Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ in the apodosis, either when the expressed apodosis belongs to an implied protasis (§ 54, 1, a), or when the Optative with av is considered a primary tense, from its resemblance in sense to the Future Indicative (54, 1, b). See also § 34, 1, b. E. g.

Οὐκοῦν καὶ τὸ ὑγιαίνειν καὶ τὸ νοσεῖν, ὅταν ἀγαθοῦ τινος αἴτια γίγνηται, αγαθά αν είη, i. e. when they prove to be the causes of any good, they would be good things (if we should accept your doctrine). XEN. Mem. IV, 2. 32. So Mem. II, 2, 3; and Plat. Rep. II, 379 B. Έγο δε ταύτην μεν την ειρήνην, εως αν είς Αθηναίων λείπηται, οὐδέποτ' αν συμβουλεύσαιμι ποιήσασθαι τη πόλει, I would never advise the city to make this peace, so long as a single Athenian shall be left. DEM. F. L. 345, 14. (Here εως λείποιτο, so long as one should be left, would be more regular.) So ARIST. Nub. 1151; SOPH. El. 697.

(b.) The Optative (without ἄν) in the relative clause occasionally depends upon a primary tense in the apodosis. This may arise from the slight distinction between the Subjunctive and Optative in such sentences (§ 54, 2, a); as in Il. XIII, 317, alπί οἱ ἐσσείται νῆας ἐνιπρῆσαι, ὅτε μὴ αὐτός γε Κρονίων ἐμβάλοι alθόμενον δαλὸν νήεσσι, it will be a hard task for him, unless the son of Kronos should hurl, &c. (More regularly, ὅτε κε μὴ ἐμβάλη, unless he shall hurl, &c.)

The Optative in the Relative clause sometimes depends on a verb of necessity, obligation, propriety, possibility, &c. with an Infinitive, the two forming an expression that is nearly equivalent in sense to an Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$, which would be expected in their place (§ 54, 2, b). E. g.

'Aλλ' δν πόλις στήσειε, τοῦδε χρὴ κλύειν, we should obey any one whom the state appoints (if the state should appoint any one, we ought to obey him). Soph. Ant. 666. (Χρὴ κλύειν is followed by the Optative from its resemblance in sense to δικαίως ἄν κλύοι τις.) 'Aλλὰ τοῦ μὲν αὐτὸν λέγειν ἃ μὴ σαφῶς εἰδείη φείδεσθαι δεῖ, i. e. we ought to abstain, &c.; like ἡείδοιτο ἄν τις. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 6, 19. Οὖς δὲ ποιήσασθαί τις βούλοιτο συνεργοὺς προθύμους, τούτους παντάπασιν ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ ἀγαθοῖς θηρατέον εἶναι. Ib. II, 4. 10. (Here θηρατέον εἶναι = θηρῶν δεῖν.) 'Υπερορῶν οὐ δυνατὸν ὑμῶν ἀνδρὶ δς εἰδείη κυρίους ὅντας ὅ τι βούλεσθε αὐτῶ χρῆσθαι. Id. Hell. VII, 3, 7.

5. The Indicative is generally used in Greek (as in Latin) in parenthetical relative clauses, like ὅ τι ποτ' ἐστίν, whatever it is (quidquid est), ὅστις ποτ' ἐστίν (οτ ἔσται), &c. E. g.

Ζεὺς, ὅστις ποτ' ἐστὶν, εἰ τόδ' αὐτῷ φίλον κεκλημένῳ, τοῦτό νιν προσεννέπω, Zeus, whoever he may be, &c. Aesch. Agam. 160. Δουλεύομεν θεοῖς, ὅ τι ποτ' εἰσὶν θεοί. Ευκ. Orest. 418.

The Subjunctive, however, sometimes occurs; in which case the expression belongs under § 62 or § 61, 3: as in Aeschin. Tim. § 127, ἀλλ' ὁ προσαψάμενος αὐτῶν καὶ παρατυχὼν, ὅστις ἃν ἢ, λόγον παρέχει. So Dem. Phil. I, 47, 24.

Assimilation in Dependent Relative Clauses.

\$64. 1. When a conditional relative clause referring to the future depends on a Subjunctive or Optative referring to the future, it regularly takes by assimilation the same mood with its leading verb. Such a leading verb may be in protasis or apodosis, in another conditional relative clause, in the expression of a wish (§ 82), or in a final clause. E. g.

'Εάν τινες οι αν δύνωνται τοῦτο ποιῶσι, καλῶς εξει, if any who shall be able do this, it will be well. Εἴ τινες οι δύναιντο τοῦτο ποιοῖεν, καλῶς αν εχοι, if any who should be able should do this, it would be

well. Εἴθε πάντες οἱ δύναιντο τοῦτο ποιοῖεν, O that all who may be able would do this. (Here the principle of assimilation makes οἱ δύναιντο after an Optative preferable to οἱ ᾶν δύνωνται, which would express the same idea.) So in Latin: Si absurde canat is qui se haberi velit musicum, turpior sit.— Sic injurias fortunae quas ferre nequeas defugiendo relinquas.

For examples see § 61, 3 and 4.

2. When a conditional relative clause depends on a secondary tense of the Indicative implying the non-fulfilment of a condition, it regularly takes a secondary tense of the Indicative by assimilation. The leading Indicative may be in protasis or apodosis (§ 49, 2), in another conditional relative clause (§ 61, 2), in an expression of a wish (§ 83), or in a final clause (§ 44, 3). E. g.

Εἴ τινες οἱ ἐδύναντο τοῦτο ἔπραξαν, καλῶς ἃν ἔσχεν, if any who had been able had done this, it would have been well. Εἴθε πάντες οἱ ἐδύναντο τοῦτο ἔπραξαν, Ο that all who had been able had done this. So in Latin: Nam si solos eos diceres miseros quibus moriendum esset, neminem tu quidem eorum qui viverent exciperes.

REMARK 1. It will be seen that this principle of assimilation accounts for the Indicative and Optative in a conditional relative sentence, which have been already explained by the analogy of the ordinary forms of protasis. (See § 61, 2 and 4.) In fact, wherever this assimilation occurs, the relative clause stands as a protasis to its antecedent clause, although the latter may be itself a protasis to another apodosis. (See § 34.) Occasionally this principle is disregarded, so that a Subjunctive depends on an Optative. (See the examples under § 34, 1, b, and § 63, 4, a.)

REMARK 2. The Indicative in the construction of § 61, 1, referring simply to the present or past, cannot be affected by assimilation, as that would change its time. E. g.

Μήτ' έμολ παρέστιος γένοιτο, μήτ' ἴσον φρονῶν, δε τάδ' ἔρδει (i. θ εἴ τις τάδ' ἔρδει). Soph. Ant. 372.

NOTE 1. The principle of § 64 applies only to conditional relative clauses. If the relative refers to a definite antecedent, so that its verb denotes a fact and not a supposition, the principle of assimilation does not apply, and the Indicative (or any other construction required by the sense, § 59, N. 1) is used. E. g.

Εἰ τῶν πολιτῶν οἶσι νῦν πιστεύομεν, τούτοις ἀπιστήσαιμεν, οῖς δ' οὐ χρωμεθα, τούτοισι χρησαίμεσθα, σωθείημεν ἄν. Arist. Ran. 1446. Εἴθ ἐσθα δυνατὸς δρᾶν ὅσον πρόθυμος εἰ, O that thou couldst do as much as thou art eager to do. Eur. Herael. 731. (If the Imperfect had been used by assimilation, the meaning would be as much as thou wert (or mightest be) eager to do.)

NOTE 2. Conditional relative clauses depending on a Subjunctive or Optative in a general supposition (§ 51, § 62) are generally assimilated to the Subjunctive or Optative; but sometimes they take the Indicative on the principle of § 62, Note 1. E. g.

Οὐδ', ἐπειδὰν ὧν ἃν πρίηται κύριος γένηται, τῷ προδότη συμβούλῳ περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἔτι χρῆται. Dem. Cor. 241, 15. See Plat. Rep. VI, 508 C and D; Charm. 164 B. 'Ο δὲ τότε μάλιστα ἔχαιρεν, ὁπότε τάχιστα τυχόντας ὧν δέοιντο ἀποπέμποι. Xen. Ages. IX, 2.

Αἰτία μὲν γάρ ἐστιν, ὅταν τις ψιλῷ χρησάμενος λόγφ μὴ παράσχηται πίστιν ὧν λέγει, ἔλεγχος δὲ, ὅταν ὧν ἀν εἴπη τις καὶ τὰληθὲς όμοῦ δείξη. Dem. Androt. 600, 5. (Here ὧν λέγει and ὧν ἀν εἴπη are nearly equivalent.) Ἐκάλει δὲ καὶ ἐτίμα ὁπότε τινὰς ἴδοι τοιοῦτον ποιήσαντας ὁ πάντας ἐβούλετο ποιεῦν. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. II, 1, 30. (Here βούλοιτο for ἐβούλετο would have corresponded to δέοιντο in the second example quoted.)

REMARK. The conjunction $\delta \ell$ is occasionally used to introduce the clause on which a relative depends. Its force here is the same as in apodosis. (See § 57.) E. g.

Οἵη περ φύλλων γενεὴ, τοίη δ ε καὶ ἀνδρῶν. Π. VI, 146. Ἐπεί τε δ πόλεμος κατέστη, ὁ δ ε φαίνεται καὶ ἐν τούτω προγνοὺς τὴν δύναμιν, and when the war broke out, (then) he appears, &c. ΤΗυς. Π, 65. Μέχρι μὲν οὖν οἱ τοξόται εἶχον τε τὰ βέλη αὐτοῖς καὶ οἱοί τε ἦσαν χρῆσθαι, οἱ δ ε ἀντεῖχον, so long as their archers both had their arrows and were able to use them, they held out. Id. II, 98. Ὠσπερ οἱ ὁπλῖται, οὕτω δ ε καὶ οἱ πελτασταί. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 5, 12. So φαίνονται δέ, ΤΗυς. I, 11; and ἐγίγνοντο δέ, ΑΕSCHIN. Cor. § 69.

Relative Clauses expressing a Purpose, Result, &c.

§ 65. 1. The relative is used with the Future Indicative to denote a purpose or object. E. g.

Πρεσβείαν δὲ πέμπειν, ήτις ταῦτ' ἐρεῖ καὶ παρέσται τοῖς πράγμασιν, and to send an embassy to say these things, and to be present at the transaction. Dem. Ol. I, 10, 1. Φημὶ δὴ δεῖν ἡμᾶς πρὸς Θεττα λοὺς πρεσβείαν πέμπειν, ἡ τοὺς μὲν διδάξει ταῦτα, τοὺς δὲ παρο ξυνεῖ. Ib. II, 21, 10. Εδοξε τῷ δήμφ τριάκοντα ἄνδρας ἐλέσθαι, οἱ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους ξυγγράψουσι, καθ' οὖς πολιτεύσουσι. ΧΕΝ. Hell. II, 3, 2. Οὐ γὰρ ἔστι μοι χρήματα. ὁπόθεν ἐκτίσω, for l have no money to pay the fine with. Plat. Apol. 37 C.

The antecedent of the relative, in this case, may be either definite or indefinite; but the negative particle is regularly $\mu\dot{\eta}$, as in final clauses (§ 43, N. 2).

REMARK. "Onws as a relative is sometimes used in this construction in a way which illustrates its use as a final particle. (See § 45, Rem.) E. g.

Ποίεε δὲ οὖτω ὅκως τῶν σῶν ἐνδεήσει μηδέν, and act so that there shall be nothing wanting on your part; lit. act in that way by which, &c. ΗDΤ. VI, 18. Τὸ οὖτως ἐπίστασθαι ἀνθρώπων ἄλλων προστατείειν ὅπως ἔξονσι πάντα τὰ ἐπιτήδεια, . . . τοῦτο θανμαστὸν ἐφαίνετο, i. e. in such a way that they shall have, &c. XEN. Cyr. I, 6, 7. So Cyr. II, 4, 31.

- Note. 1. (a.) The Future Indicative is the only form regularly used in prose after the relative in this sense. It is retained even after secondary tenses, seldom being changed to the Future Optative, which would here be expected by § 31, 2, and by the analogy of clauses with $\tilde{\sigma}\pi\omega s$ (§ 45). The Future Optative, however, is found in Soph. O. T. 796, $\tilde{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\nu\gamma o\nu$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\theta a$ $\mu\dot{\eta}\pi\sigma\tau$ \dot{o} ψ o $\dot{\iota}$ $\mu\eta$ ν $\dot{o}\nu\epsilon\dot{l}\delta\eta$, and probably in Plat. Rep. III, 416 C, ϕ ain $\tilde{a}\nu$ ris $\delta\epsilon\hat{i}\nu$ kal ràs olikhous for a voiabry advois $\pi a \rho a \sigma \kappa \epsilon v a \sigma a \sigma a$, $\tilde{\eta} r is$ $\mu\dot{\eta}\tau\epsilon$ tous $\phi\dot{\nu}\lambda \alpha a s$ $\dot{\omega}s$ $\dot{a}\rho i \sigma \tau o s$ $\dot{\epsilon}i\nu a$ α and σ or advois, kakoupy $\dot{\epsilon}i\nu$ te $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\dot{\epsilon}\pi$ a ρ o $\hat{\epsilon}$ $\pi\epsilon\rho$ rous $\tilde{a}\lambda\lambda o vs$ $\pi o\lambda i \tau a s$
- (b.) When, however, this Future is quoted indirectly after a past tense, or depends upon a clause expressing a past purpose (which is equivalent to standing in indirect discourse, § 26, N. 1), it is sometimes changed to the Future Optative, like any other Future Indicative. E. g.

'Εσκόπει ὅπως ἔσοιτο αὐτῷ ὅστις ζῶντά τε γηροτροφήσοι καὶ τελευτήσαντα θάψοι αὐτόν. ISAE. de. Menecl. Her. § 10. Αἰρεθέντες ἐφ ῷ τε ξυγγράψαι νόμους, καθ οὕστινας πολιτεύσοιντο, having been chosen with the condition that they should compile the laws by which they were to govern. Xen. Hell. II, 3, 11. (This is a sort of indirect quotation of the sentence which appears in its direct form in Hell. II, 3, 2, the example under § 65, 1.)

Note 2. In Homer, the Future Indicative is sometimes used in this sense; as in Od. XIV, 333, ἐπαρτέας, οἱ δή μιν πέμψουσιν. Sometimes the Optative with κέ, as an apodosis, takes the place of the Future; as in Od. IV, 167, ἄλλοι οἴ κεν ἀλάλκοιεν. The more common Epic construction is, however, the Subjunctive (generally with κέ joined to the relative) after primary tenses, and the Optative (Present or Aorist, never Future), without κέ, after secondary tenses. E. g.

Ελκος δ' ἰητὴρ ἐπιμάσσεται, ἢδ' ἐπιθήσει

Φάρμαχ', ἄ κεν παύσησι μελαινάων όδυνάων. Π. ΙV, 191.

Αλλ' ἄγετε, κλητούς ότρύνομεν, οί κε τάχιστα "Ελθωσ' ές κλισίην Πηληιάδεω 'Αχιλήος. II. ΙΧ, 165. "Εκδοτε, καὶ τιμὴν ἀποτινέμεν ἥν τιν' ἔοικεν, "Η τε καὶ εσσομένοισι μετ' άθανάτοισι π έληται. Π. ΙΙΙ, 459.

"Αγγελον ήκαν, δε άγγείλειε γυναικί. Od. XV, 458.

Πάπτηνεν δ' ἀνὰ πύργον 'Αχαιῶν, εἴ τιν' ἴδοιτο

Ήγεμόνων, ος τίς οἱ ἀρὴν ἐτάροισιν ἀμύναι. Π. ΧΙΙ, 332.

REMARK. It will be noticed that the earlier Greek here agrees with the Latin (in using the Subjunctive and Optative), while the Attic Greek differs from the Latin by using the more vivid Future Indicative.

Note 3. (a.) The Attic Greek allows the Subjunctive in such phrases as exel o ti elan, he has something to say; where the irregularity seems to be caused by the analogy of the common expression οὐκ ἔχει ὅ τι (or τί) εἴπη, equivalent to οὐκ οἶδεν ὅ τι εἴπη, he knows not what he shall say, which contains an indirect question (§ 71). E. g.

Τοιοῦτον ἔθος παρέδοσαν, ὥστε . . . έκατέρους ἔχειν ἐφ' οἶς φιλοτιμηθωσιν, that both may have things in which they may glory. Isoc. Pan. p. 49 C. § 44. (Here there is no indirect question, for the meaning is not that they may know in what they are to glory. See note added to Felton's Isocrates, p. 135.) Οὐδὲν ἔτι διοίσει αὐτῷ, έαν μόνον έχη ότω διαλέγηται, if only he shall have some one to talk with. PLAT. Symp. 194 D. Τοις μέλλουσιν έξειν ο τι είσφέρωσιν. XEN. Occon. VII, 20. (Compare ἀπορείς ο τι λέγης and εὐπορείς ο τι λέγης in the same sentence, Plat. Ion. 535 B.)

(b.) The Present or Aorist Optative very rarely occurs in Attic Greek after a past tense, but more frequently after another Optative. E. g.

"Ανδρα οὐδέν" ἔντοπον (όρῶν), οὐχ ὅστις ἀρκέσειεν, οὐδ' ὅστις νόσου κάμνοντι συλλάβοιτο, i. e. when I saw no one there to assist me, &c. SOPH. Phil. 281. Γόνιμον δὲ ποιητήν ᾶν οὐχ ευροις ἔτι ζητῶν αν, δστις ρημα γενναίον λάκοι, i. e. a poet to speak a noble word. ARIST. Ran. 96. (Yet in vs. 98 we have the regular ὅστις Φθέγξεται, depending on the same οὐκ αν εύροις.) So in Plat. Rep. III, 398 B, δς μιμοίτο καὶ λέγοι, depending on χρώμεθα ἄν. Τῆ ἡμετέρα πόλει οὐδεν αν ενδείξαιτο τοσούτον οὐδε ποιήσειεν, ὑΦ' οὖ πεισθέντες τινας Ελλήνων έκείνω προείσθε, i. e. nothing so great, that you would be persuaded by it to sacrifice any of the Greeks to him. DEM. Phil. II, 67, 20.

Note 4. 'Os as a relative, in the sense of by which (with an antecedent like anything understood), is sometimes followed by an Optative with $d\nu$ in apodosis, expressing a purpose or object. E. g.

'Ως μέν ᾶν εἴποιτε δικαίους λόγους καὶ λέγοντος ἄλλου συνείητε, αμείνου Φιλίπτου παρεσκεύασθε, ώς δί κωλύσαιτ' αν εκείνον πραττειν ταθτα εφ' ων έστι νθν, παντελώς άργως έχετε, i. e. as to means by which you could make just speeches, &c., you are better prepared than Philip; but as to anything by which you could prevent him from doing what he is now about, you are wholly inactive. DEM. Phil. II, 66, 15. So at the end of the same oration, ώς δ' αν έξετασθείη μάλιστ' άκριβώς, μη γένοιτο, i. e. may nothing come upon us by which the truth of what I say would be thoroughly tested.

NOTE 5. The relative with any tense of the Indicative, or even with the Optative and av, can be used to denote a result, where ἄστε might have been expected. (§ 65, 3). This occurs chiefly after negatives, or interrogatives implying a negative. E. g.

Τίς ουτως εὐήθης έστιν ύμων, οστις άγνοει τὸν ἐκείθεν πόλεμον δεθρο ήξοντα, αν αμελήσωμεν; i. e. who of you is so simple as not to know, &c.? Dem. Ol. I, 13, 16. (Here ώστε αγνοείν might have been used.) Τίς οὕτω πόρρω τῶν πολιτικῶν ἦν πραγμάτων, ὅστις οὐκ έγγυς ήναγκάσθη γενέσθαι των συμφορών; Isoc. Pan. p. 64 B. § 113. Τίς οῦτως ράθυμός έστιν, δστις οὐ μετασχείν βουλήσεται ταύτης της στρατείας; Β. p. 79 D. § 185. Οὐδείς αν γένοιτο οὕτως αδαμάντινος, δε αν μείνειεν εν τῆ δικαιοσύνη, πο one would ever become so adamantine that he would remain firm in justice. Plat. Rep. II, 360 B.

2. 'Εφ' φ or έφ' φτε, on condition that, which is commonly followed by the Infinitive (§ 99), sometimes takes the Future Indicative. E. g.

Έπὶ τούτω δὲ ὑπεξίσταμαι τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἐφ' ὧτε ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ὑμέων αρξομαι, I withdraw upon this condition, that I shall be ruled, &c. Η DT. III, 83. Τούτοισι δ' ων πίσυνος εων κατήγαγε, επ' ωτε οι απόγονοι αὐτοῦ ἱροφάνται τῶν θεῶν ἔσονται. ΗΔΤ. VII, 153. Καὶ τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἐξέλιπον ᾿Αθηναῖοι πᾶσαν, σπονδὰς ποιησάμενοι ἐφ' ὧ τοὺς ανδρας κομιούνται. THUC. I, 113. Συνέβησαν έφ' ώτε έξίασιν έκ Πελοποννήσου υπόσπονδοι και μηδέποτε έπιβήσονται αυτής. Id. I, 103.

It will be noticed here (as in Note 1) that the Future Indicative generally remains unchanged even after a secondary tense.

3. " $\Omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ (sometimes $\dot{\omega}$ s), so that, so as, is usually followed by the Infinitive. (See § 98.) But when the action of the verb expressing the result after ωστε is viewed chiefly as an independent fact, and not merely as a result, the Indicative can be used.

The Infinitive is sometimes used even here, when the Indic-

ative would seem more natural; and it often makes quite as little difference which of the two is used, as it does in English whether we say some are so strange as not to be ashamed (οῦτως ἄτοποι ὥστε οὐκ αἰσχύνεσθαι, Dem. F. L. 439, 29), or some are so strange that they are not ashamed (ὥστε οὐκ αἰσχύνονται). Here, although both expressions have the same general meaning, the former expresses the result merely as a result, while the latter expresses it also (and more distinctly) as an independent fact. E. g.

Οὕτως ἀγνωμόνως ἔχετε, ὥστε ἐλπίζετε αὐτὰ χρηστὰ γενήσεσθαι, κ.τ.λ. are you so senseless that you expect, &c. Dem. Ol. II, 25, 19. (Here ὥστε ἐλπίζειν, so senseless as to expect, would merely make the fact of their expecting less prominent.) Οὕτως ἡμῖν δοκεῖ παντὸς ἄξια εἶναι, ὥστε πάντες τὸ καταλιπεῖν αὐτὰ μάλιστα φεύγομεν, so that we all especially avoid, &c. Xen. Mem. II, 2, 3. Οὐχ ἦκεν ʹὧσθ' οἱ Έλληνες ἐφρόντιζον. Id. An. II, 3, 25. Εἰς τοῦτ ἀπληστίας ἦλθον, ὥστ' οὖκ ἐξήρκεσεν αὐτοῖς ἔχειν τὴν κατὰ γῆν ἀρχὴν, ἀλλικαὶ τὴν κατὰ θάλατταν δύναμιν οὕτως ἐπεθύμησαν λαβεῖν, ὥστε τοὺς συμμάχους τοὺς ἡμετέρους ἀφίστασαν. Isoc. Panath. p. 254 A. § 103. So after ὡς, § 98, 2, N. 1: Οὕτω δή τι κλεινὴ ἐγένετο, ὡς καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἑλληνες Ροδώπιος τοὕνομα ἐξέμαθον, ἱ. e. so that all the Greeks came to know well the name of Rhodopis. Hot. II, 135.

Note. As note in this construction has no effect whatever upon the mood of the verb, it may be followed by any construction that would be allowed in an independent sentence. (See § 59, N. 1.) It may thus take an Optative or Indicative in apodosis with $\tilde{a}\nu$, or even an Imperative. E. g.

"Ωστ' οὐκ ἄν αὐτὸν γνωρίσαιμ' ἄν εἰσιδών. Ευπ. Οτ. 379. Παθών μὲν ἀντέδρων, ὥστ', εἰ φρονῶν ἔπρασσον, σὐδ' ἄν ὧδ' ἐγιγνόμην κακός. Soph. O. C. 271. Θνητὸς δ' Ἰορέστης ιωστε μὴ λίαν στένε. Id. El. 1172. So with οὐ μή and the Subjunctive (89, 1); οὕτως ἐπιτεθύμηκα ἀκοῦσαι, ὥστε...οὐ μή σου ἀπολειφθῶ. Plat

Phaedr. 227 D.

4. The relative has sometimes a causal signification, being equivalent to 671, because, and a personal pronoun or demonstrative word. The verb is in the Indicative, as in ordinary causal sentences (§ 81, 1). E. g.

Θαυμαστὸν ποιεῖs, δs ἡμῖν οὐδὲν δίδωs, you do a strange thing in giving us nothing (like ὅτι σὰ οὐδὲν δίδωs). XEN. Mem. II, 7, 13. Δόξαs ἀμαθὴς εἶναι, δς . . . ἐκέλευ ε, having seemed to be unlearned, because he commanded, &c. Η Πτ. I, 33. Τὴν μητέρα ἐμακάριζον, οἶως τέκνων ἐκύρησε (like ὅτι τοίων). Id. I, 31. Εὐδαίμων ἐφάινετο, ὡς ἀδεῶς καὶ γενναίως ἐτελεύτα, ῖ. e. because he died so fearlessly and nobly (ὡς being equivalent to ὅτι οὖτως). Plat. Phaed. 58 E.

Ταλαίπωρος εἶ, ῷ μήτε θεοὶ πατρῷοί εἰσι μήθ' ἱερά, i. e. since you have no ancestral Gods, &c. Plat. Euthyd. 302 B. (See Remark.) Πῶς ἄν ὀρθῶς ἐμοῦ καταγιγνώσκοιτε, ῷ τὸ παράπαν πρὸς τουτονὶ μηδέν συμβόλαιόν ἐστιν; i. e. since I have no contract at all, &c. Dem. Apat. 903, 22. So Arist. Ran. 1459.

Remark. The ordinary negative particle of a causal relative sentence is où, as in the first example above. (See § 81.) But if a conditional force is combined with the causal, $\mu\dot{\eta}$ can be used. Thus in the last examples above, in which $\mu\dot{\eta}$ is used, $\ddot{\phi}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\theta\epsilon oi$ $\epsilon l\sigma\iota\nu$ (besides its causal force) implies if, as it appears, you are without ancestral Gods; and $\ddot{\phi}$ $\mu\eta\dot{\phi}\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$, if, as it appears, I have no contract. The same combination of a causal and a conditional force is seen in the Latin siquidem.

Temporal Particles signifying Until and Before that.

Α. "Εως, "Εστε, "Αχρι, Μέχρι, Εἰσόκε, "Οφρα, Until.

§ 66. 1. When ἕως, ἔστε, ἄχρι, μέχρι, and ὄφρα, until, refer to a definite point of past time, at which the action of the verb actually took place, they take the Indicative. E. g.

Νῆχον πάλιν, ἔως ἐπῆλθον εἰς ποταμόν, I swam on again, until I came to a river. Od. VII, 280. Πίνει, ἔως ἐθέρμην' αὐτὸν ἀμφιβᾶσα φλὸξ οἴνου. Ευκ. Αἰς. 758. Ευνεῖρον ἀπιόντες, ἔστε ἐπὶ ταῖς σκηναῖς ἐγένοντο. ΧεΝ. Cyr. VII, 5, 6. (So An. III, 4, 49.) Καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίουν μέχρι σκότος ἐγένοτο. Id. An. IV, 2, 4. (So III, 4, 8.) ΚΩς μὲν Θρήικας ἄνδρας ἐπώχετο Τυδέος υἰὸς, ὅφρα δυώδεκ ἔπεφνεν. II. X, 488. Ἦρχ ἵμεν, ὄφρ ἀφίκοντο κατὰ στρατὸν, ἢ μιν ἀνώγει. II. XIII, 329. Ἦκεν, ὅφρα μέγα σπέος ἵκετο. Od. V, 57.

Note 1. "A $\chi \rho \iota$ où and $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota$ où are used in the same sense as, $\Hag{a}\chi \rho \iota$ and $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \chi \rho \iota$. E. g.

Τῶν δὲ ταῦτα πραξάντων ἄχρι οὖ ὅδε ὁ λόγος ἐγράφετο Γισίφονος πρεσβύτατος ὧν τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὴν ἀρχὴν εἶχε. ΧΕΝ. Hell. VI, 4, 37. Τοὺς Ἔλληνας ἀπελύσατο δουλείας, ὥστ' ἐλευθέρους εἶναι μέχρι οὖ πάλιν αὐτοὶ αὐτοὺς κατεδοιλώσαντο. PLAT. Menex. 245 A.

Note 2. Herodotus uses ès \ddot{o} or ès $o\ddot{v}$, until, like $\ddot{\epsilon}\omega s$, with the Indicative. E. g.

'Απεδείκυυσαν παίδα πατρός εκαστον εόντα, ες δ απέδεξαν απάσας αυτάς. Η DT. II, 143. 'Ες οδ Λίχης ανεύρε. I, 67.

2. When these particles refer to the future, they are

joined with $\tilde{a}\nu$ or $\kappa\epsilon'$ and take the Subjunctive, if the leading verb is primary. (See § 61, 3.) But if such clauses depend upon an Optative in protasis or apodosis, or in a wish, they usually take the Optative (without $\tilde{a}\nu$) by assimilation. (See § 61, 4.) E. g.

Μαχήσομαι αὖθι μένων, εἴως κε τέλος πολέμοιο κιχείω, until I shall come to an end of the war. II. III, 291. "Εως δ' ἀν οὖν πρὸς τοῦ παρόντος ἐκμάθης, ἔχ ἐλπίδα. SOPH. O. T. 834. 'Επίσχες, ἔστ' ἀν καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ προσ μάθης, wait until you shall learn, &c. ÅESCH. Prom. 697. Μέχρι δ' ἀν ἐγὼ ἤκω, αὶ σπονδαὶ μενόντων. ΧΕΝ. Απ. II, 3, 24. 'Αλλὰ μέν', ὄφρα κέ τοι μελιηδέα οἶνον ἐνείκω, but wait, until I shall bring, &c. II. VI, 258. So ὄφρ' ἀν τίσωσιν, II. I, 509.

Καὶ τὸ μὲν ἂν ἐξαλείφοιεν, τὸ δὲ πάλιν ἐγγράφοιεν, εως ὅ τι μάλιστα ἀνθρώπεια ἤθη θεοφιλῆ ποιήσειαν, until they should make, &c. PLAT. Rep. VI, 501 C. Εἰ δὲ πάνυ σπουδάζοι φαγείν, είποιμ' ἄν ὅτι παρὰ ταῖς γυναιξίν ἐστιν, εως παρατείναιμι τοῦτον, i. e. I would tell him this, until I put him to torture. XEN. Cyr. I, 3, 11.

Note 1. It will be seen by the examples, that the clause after $\tilde{\epsilon}_{ws}$ and other particles signifying until sometimes implies a future purpose or object, the attainment of which is desired. When such a sentence, implying a purpose or object which would have been originally expressed by a Subjunctive, depends upon a past tense, it generally takes the Optative (§ 31, 1); but the Subjunctive also may be used, in order to retain the mood in which the purpose would have been originally conceived (as in final clauses, § 44, 2). For the general principle, see § 77. E. g.

Σπονδὰς ἐποιήσαντο, ἔως ἀπαγγελθείη τὰ λεχθέντα εἰς Λακεδαίμονα, they made a truce, (to continue) until what had been said should be announced at Sparta. Xen. Hell. III, 2, 20. (Here ἔως ἃν ἀπαγγελθη might have been used; as in Thuc. I, 90, ἐκέλευεν (τοὺς πρέσβεις) ἐπισχεῖν, ἔως ἃν τὸ τεῖχος ἱκανὸν αἴρωσιν.) See § 77, 1, d.

Note 2. Homer uses εἰς ὅ κε (or εἰσόκε), until, with the Subjunctive, as Herodotus uses ἐς ὅ with the Indicative (§ 66, 1, N. 2);
as μίμνετε, εἰς ὅ κεν ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμοιο ἔλωμεν, Il. II. 332. Εἰς ὅ
κε may take the Optative, retaining κέ; as in Il. XV, 70.

Note 3. "An is sometimes omitted after $\ell\omega$ s, &c. (including $\pi\rho\ell\nu$, § 67, 1) when they take the Subjunctive, as in common protasis and in relative sentences (§ 50, 1, N. 3; § 63, 1); after $\mu\ell\chi\rho$ 1 and $\pi\rho\ell\nu$ this occurs even in Attic prose. Thus $\ell\sigma$ 2 e $\ell\gamma$ 2 $\ell\gamma$ 3 Doph. Aj. 1183; $\mu\ell\chi\rho$ 1 $\pi\lambda$ 0 $\ell\gamma$ 3 yé $\ell\gamma$ 7 att., Thuc. I, 137: see Thuc. IV, 16; Aeschin. Cor. § 60.

3. When the clause introduced by $\epsilon\omega_s$, &c., until, refers to a result which was not attained in past time in consequence of the non-fulfilment of a condition, it takes a secondary tense of the Indicative. (See § 63, 2.) E. g.

Ήδέως αν τούτω ἔτι διελεγόμην, ἔως αὐτῷ τὴν τοῦ ᾿Αμφίονος ἀπέδωκα ρῆσιν ἀντὶ τῆς τοῦ Ζήθου, I should gladly have continued to talk with him, until I had given him, &c. Plat. Gorg. 506 B. Οὐκ αν ἐπαυόμην, ἔως ἀπεπειράθην τῆς σοφίας ταυτησί. Id. Crat. 396 C Ἐπισχών ἀν, ἔως οἱ πλείστοι τῶν εἰωθότων γνώμην ἀπεφήναντο, ... ἡσυχίαν αν ἢγον, i. e. I should have waited until most of the regular speakers had declared their opinion, &c. Dem. Phil. I, § 1. (For ἄν here, see § 42, 3.)

The leading verb must be an Indicative implying the non-fulfilment of a condition.

4. When the clause introduced by $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega s$, &c., until, depends upon a verb denoting a customary action or a general truth, and refers indefinitely to any one of a series of occasions, it takes $\tilde{a}\nu$ and the Subjunctive after primary tenses, and the simple Optative after secondary tenses. (See § 62.) E. g.

[°] A δ' ἀν ἀσύντακτα η, ἀνάγκη ταὺτα ἀεὶ πράγματα παρέχειν, ἔως ἀν χώραν λάβη, they must always make trouble, until they are put in order. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. IV, 5, 37. [°] Οπότε ὅρα εἴη ἀρίστου, ἀνέμενεν αὐτοὺς ἔστε ἐμφάγοι ἐν τι, ὡς μὴ βουλιμῷεν. Ib. VIII, 144. Περιεμένομεν οὖν ἐκάστοτε, ἔως ἀνοιχθείη τὸ δεσμωτήριον, we waited every day, until the prison was opened. Plat. Phaed. 59 D. (This may mean until the prison should be opened; § 66, 2, N 1.)

Note. "An is sometimes omitted after $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega s$, &c. and $\pi\rho\ell\nu$, when they take the Subjunctive in this sense, as well as in the other construction (§ 66, 2, N. 3); as $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\hat{\varphi}$ $\phi\rho\sigma\nu\hat{\epsilon}\nu$ $\gamma\hat{\alpha}\rho$ $\mu\eta\delta\hat{\epsilon}\nu$ $\eta\hat{\delta}\sigma\sigma\sigma s$ $\delta\hat{\iota}\sigmas$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega s$ $\tau\hat{\sigma}$ $\chi a\ell\rho\hat{\epsilon}\iota\nu$ $\kappa\hat{\alpha}\iota$ $\tau\hat{\sigma}$ $\lambda\nu\pi\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}\sigma\theta a\iota$ $\mu\hat{a}\theta\eta s$. Suppl. Aj. 555. So $\tilde{\sigma}\phi\rho a$ $\tau\hat{\epsilon}-\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\eta$, Ii. I, 82; and $\hat{\epsilon}s$ où $a\pi\sigma\theta\hat{\iota}\nu\omega\sigma\iota$, Hdt. III, 31.

REMARK. When $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega s$ and $\tilde{\delta}\phi\rho a$ mean so long as, they are relatives, and are included under §§ 58-64. "Oppa in all its senses is confined to Epic and Lyric poetry. (See § 43, N. 1.)

B. Πρίν, Until, Before that.

§ 67. $\Pi \rho l \nu$, before, before that, until, besides taking the Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative, on the same principles with $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega s$, &c. (§ 66), may also take the Infinitive (§ 106). The question of choice between the Infinitive and the finite moods generally depends on the nature of the leading clause.

Πρίν regularly takes the Subjunctive and Optative (when they are allowed) only if the leading clause is negative or

interrogative with a negative implied; very seldom if that is affirmative. It takes the Indicative after both negative and affirmative clauses, but chiefly after negatives.

In Homer the Infinitive is the mood regularly used with $\pi \rho i \nu$, after both affirmative and negative clauses; in Attic Greek it is regularly used after affirmatives, and seldom after negatives.

1. The Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative after $\pi \rho i \nu$ follow the rules already given for $\tilde{\epsilon} \omega s$, &c. (§ 66). E. g.

(Indic. § 66, 1.) Οὐκ ἦν ἀλέξημ' οὐδὲν, ἀλλὰ φαρμάκων χρεία κατεσκέλλοντο, πρίν γ' ἐγώ σφισιν ἔδειξα κράσεις ἦπίων ἀκεσμάτων, until I showed them, &c. Aesch. Prom. 481. Πάλιν τοῦτο τέμνων οὐκ ἐπανῆκε, πρίν ἐλοιδόρησε μάλ' ἐν δίκη. Plat. Phaedr. 266 Α. Οὐκ ἡξίωσαν νεώτερόν τι ποιεῖν ἐς αὐτὸν, πρίν γε δὴ αὐτοῖς ἀνὴρ 'Αργίλιος μηνυτὴς γίγνεται, until he becomes, &c. (Histor. Pres.) Thuc. I, 132. Πολλὰ ἔπαθεν, πρίν γέ οἱ χρυσάμπυκα κούρα χαλινὸν Παλλὰς ἤνεγκεν. Pind. Ol. XIII, 92. 'Ανωλόλυξε πρὶν ὁρᾶ. Ευκ. Me.l. 1173.

(Subj. and Opt. § 66, 2.) Οὔ κώ σε ἐγὰ λέγω (εὐδαίμονα), πρὶν τὸν εντήσαντα καλῶς τὸν αἰῶνα πύθωμαι. ΗDT. Ι, 32. Οὐδὲ λήξει, πρὶν τὸν ἡ κορ ἐση κέαρ, ἡ ἔλη τις ἀρχάν. AESCH. Pron. 165. Οὐ χρή με ἐνθένδε ἀπελθεῖν, πρὶν τὸν ὁδ δίκην. ΧΕΝ. ΑΝ. Υ, 7, 5. 'λλλ οὐπότ' ἔγωγ' ἀν, πρὶν ἴδοιμ' ὀρθὸν ἔπος, μεμφομένων τὸν καταφαίην. Soph. O. T. 505. So Theogn. 126, πρὶν πειρηθείης. So πρὶν ἐξελκύσειεν, depending on a protasis (εἰ μὴ ἀνείη), Plat. Rep. VII, 515 Ε. "Ολοιο μήπω, πρὶν μάθοιμ' εἰ καὶ πάλιν γνώμην μετοίσεις. Soph. Phil. 961. (Πρίν after Opt. in wish.) 'Απηγόρενε μηδένα βάλλειν, πρὶν Κῦρος ἐμπλησθείς ηθημῶν, until Cyrus should be satisfied. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 4, 14. (§ 66, 2, Ν. 1.)

(Indic. § 66, 3.) Έχρην οὖν τοὺς ἄλλους μὴ πρότερον περὶ τῶν δ μολογουμένων συμβουλεύειν, πρὶν περὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων ἡμᾶς έδίδα ξ aν, they ought not to have given advice, &c., until they had

instructed us, &c. Isoc. Paneg. p. 44 C. § 19.

(Subj. and Opt. § 66, 4.) Ορῶσι τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους οὐ πρόσθεν ἀπιόντας γαστρὸς ἔνεκα, πρὶν ἃν ἀφ ῶ σιν οἱ ἄρχοντες. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 2, 8. Οὐ γὰρ πρότερον κατήγορος παρὰ τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ἰσχύει, πρὶν ἄν ὁ φεύγων ἀδυνατήση τὰς προειρημένας αἰτίας ἀπολύσασθαι. ΑΕΝ-CHIN. F. L. § 2. Οὐδαμόθεν ἀφίεσαν, πρὶν παραθεῖεν αὐτοῖς ἄριστον, before they had placed before them. ΧΕΝ. ΑΝ. ΙV, 5, 30.

(Subj. without ἄν. § 66, 2, N. 3.) Μὴ στέναζε, πρὶν μάθη s. Sor II. Phil. 917. So Od. X, 175; Hdt. I, 136; Plat. Phaed. 62 C.

2. For $\pi\rho i\nu$ with the Infinitive, see § 106.

NOTE 1. In Homer, πρίν is not found with the Indicative, πρίν y ore taking its place; a few cases occur of the Subjunctive (with out av) and the Optative; but the most common Homeric construction, in sentences of all kinds, is that with the Infinitive (§ 106). E. g.

"Ημεθ' ἀτυζόμεναι, σανίδες δ' έχον εὖ ἀραρυῖαι, πρίν γ' ὅτε δή με σὸς υίὸς ἀπὸ μεγάροιο κάλεσσεν, i. e. before the time when, &c. Od. XXIII, 43. So II. IX, 588; XII, 437. ^{*}Ω φίλοι, οὐ γάρ πω καταδυσόμεθ ἀχνύμενοί περ εls 'Αίδαο δόμους, πριν μόρσιμον ήμαρ έπέλθη. Od. X, 175. Οὐκ ἔθελεν φεύγειν πρίν πειρήσαιτ' 'Αχιλήσε. Π. ΧΧΙ, 580. Πρίν γ' ὅτ' ἄν with the Subjunctive is found in Od. II, 374, and IV, 477.

NOTE 2. In iv with the Infinitive after negative sentences is most common in Homer (Note 1), rare in the Attic poets, and again more frequent in Attic prose. (See Krüger, Vol. II, p. 258.) For examples see § 106.

Examples of the Subjunctive or Optative with πρίν after affirmative sentences are very rare. One occurs in Isoc. Paneg. p. 44 A, § 16; οστις οὖν οἴεται τοὺς ἄλλους κοινη τι πράξειν γαθον, πρὶν αν τούς προεστώτας αὐτών διαλλάξη, λίαν άπλώς έχει.

Note 3. Πρίν ή, πρότερον ή (priusquam), and πρόσθεν ή may be used in the same constructions as $\pi \rho i \nu$. $\Pi \rho i \nu \eta$ is especially common in Herodotus. E. g.

Οὐ γὰρ δὴ πρότερον ἀπανέστη, πρὶν ή σφεας ὑποχειρίους ἐποιήσατο. HDT. VI, 45. So THUC. VI, 61. 'Αδικέει αναπειθόμενος πρίν ή άτρεκέως έκμάθη. Η DT. VII, 10. Εύχετο μηδεμίαν οί συντυχίην τοιαύτην γενέσθαι, η μιν παύσει καταστρέψασθαι την Ευρώπην, πρότερον η έπι τέρμασι τοισι εκείνης γένηται. Id. VII, 54. Πρότερον ή with Indic., PLAT. Phaedr. 232 Ε. Πρόσθεν ή σὺ έφαίνου, τοῦτ' ἐκηρύχθη. SOPH. O. T. 736. 'Απεκρίνατο ὅτι πρόσθεν αν ἀποθάνοιεν ή τὰ ὅπλα παραδοίησαν, that they would die before they would give up their arms. XEN. An. II, 1, 10. (See \$ 66, 2.)

For examples of the Infinitive after all these expressions, see

§ 106. Even υστερον ή is found with the Infinitive.

Note 4. Πρίν or πρὶν ή is very often preceded by πρότερον, πρόσθεν, πάρος, or another πρίν (used as an adverb), in the leading clause. E. g.

Οὐ πρότερον πρὸς ήμας τὸν πόλεμον έξέφηναν, πρὶν ἐνόμισαν, κ.τ.λ. ΧΕΝ. An. III, 1, 16. Οὐ τοίνυν ἀποκρινοῦμαι πρότερον, πρὶν ἃν πύθωμαι. Plat. Euthyd. 295 C. Καὶ οὐ πρόσθεν ἔστησαν, πρὶν ἡ πρὸς τοις πεζοις τῶν Ασσυρίων ἐγένοντο. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 4, 28. For examples with the Infinitive, see § 106.

When $\pi \rho i \nu$ appears to be followed by a primary tense of the Indicative, it is an adverb qualifying the verb. E. g.

Την δ' έγω οὐ λύσω πρίν μιν καὶ γηρας επεισιν, i. e. sooner shall old age come upon her. Il. 1, 29.

SECTION IV.

INDIRECT DISCOURSE, INCLUDING INDIRECT QUOTATIONS
AND QUESTIONS.

§ 68. 1. The words or thoughts of any person may be quoted either directly or indirectly.

A direct quotation is one which gives the exact words

of the original speaker or writer.

An indirect quotation is one in which the words of the original speaker conform to the construction of the sentence in which they are quoted. Thus the expression ταῦτα βούλομαι may be quoted either directly, as λέγει τις "ταῦτα βούλομαι," or indirectly, as λέγει τις ὅτι ταῦτα βούλεται or λέγει τις ταῦτα βούλεσθαι, some one says that he wishes for these.

- 2. Indirect quotations may be introduced by $\delta\tau\iota$ or ω s (negatively $\delta\tau\iota$ où, ω s où) or by the Infinitive, as in the example given above; sometimes also by the Participle (§ 73, 2).
- 3. Indirect questions follow the same rules as indirect quotations, in regard to their moods and tenses. (For examples see § 70.)

Note. The term indirect discourse must be understood to apply to all clauses which express indirectly the words or thoughts of any person (those of the speaker himself as well as those of another), after verbs which imply thought or the expression of thought (verba sentiendi et declarandi), and even after such expressions as $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \delta \nu \ \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \nu$, &c.

The term may be further applied to any single dependent clause in any sentence, which indirectly expresses the thought of any other person than the speaker (or past thoughts of the speaker himself), even when the preceding clauses are not in indirect discourse. (See § 77.)

General Principles of Indirect Discourse.

Remark. The following are the general principles of indirect discourse, the application of which to particular cases is shown in §§ 70-77.

§ 69. 1. In indirect quotations after $\delta \tau \iota$ or δs and in indirect questions, after *primary* tenses, each verb retains both the mood and the tense of the direct discourse, no change being made except (when necessary) in the *person* of the verb.

After secondary tenses, each primary tense of the Indicative and each Subjunctive of the direct discourse may be either changed to the same tense of the Optative or retained in its original mood and tense. The Imperfect and Pluperfect, having no tenses in the Optative, are regularly retained in the Indicative. (See, however, § 70, Note 1, b.) The Aorist Indicative remains unchanged when it belongs to a dependent clause of the direct discourse (§ 74, 2); but it may be changed to the Optative, like the primary tenses, when it belongs to the leading clause (§ 70, 2). The Indicative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ belongs under § 69, 2.

- 2. All secondary tenses of the Indicative implying non-fulfilment of a condition (§ 49, 2), and all Optatives (with or without $\tilde{a}\nu$), are retained without change in either mood or tense, after both primary and secondary tenses.
- 3. When, however, the verb on which the quotation depends is followed by the Infinitive or Participle, the leading verb of the quotation is changed to the corresponding tense of the Infinitive or Participle, after both primary and secondary tenses ($\mathring{a}\nu$ being retained when there is one), and the dependent verbs follow the preceding rules. (See § 73.)

- 4. The adverb $\tilde{a}\nu$ is never joined with a verb in indirect discourse, unless it stood also in the direct form: on the other hand, $\tilde{a}\nu$ is never omitted with a verb in indirect discourse, if it was used in the direct form. When $\tilde{a}\nu$ is joined to a relative word or particle before a Subjunctive in the direct discourse, it is regularly dropped when the Subjunctive is changed to the Optative in indirect discourse. (See, however, § 74, 1, N. 2.)
- 5. The indirect discourse regularly retains the same negative particle which would be used in the direct form. But the Infinitive and Participle occasionally take $\mu\dot{\eta}$ in indirect quotation, where $o\dot{v}$ would be used in direct discourse. See examples under § 73.

Simple Sentences in Indirect Quotations after $\delta\tau\iota$ or $\omega\varsigma$ and in Indirect Questions.

- § 70. When the direct discourse is a simple sentence, the verb of which stands in any tense of the Indicative (without $\tilde{a}\nu$), the principle of § 69, 1, gives the following rules for indirect quotations after $\tilde{\delta}\tau\iota$ or $\dot{\omega}$ s and for indirect questions:—
- 1. After *primary* tenses the verb stands in the *Indicative*, in the tense used in the direct discourse. E. g.

Λέγει ὅτι γράφει, he says that he is writing; λέγει ὅτι ἔγραφεν, he says that he was writing; λέγει ὅτι γέγραφεν, he says that he has written; λέγει ὅτι ἐγεγράφει, he says that he had written; λέγει ὅτι ἔγραψει, he says that he shall write.

Λέγει γὰρ ὡς οὐδέν ἐστιν ἀδικώτερον φήμης. Aeschin. Timarch. § 125. Οὐ γὰρ ᾶν τοῦτό γὰ εἴποις, ὡς ἔλαθεν. Id. F. L. § 151 (160). Εὐ δ' ἴστε, ὅτι πλεῖστον διαφέρει φήμη καὶ συκοφαντία. Ib. § 145 (153). 'Αλλ' ἐννοεῖν χρὴ τοῦτο μὲν, γυναῖχ' ὅτι ἔφυμεν. Soph. Apt. 61. Καὶ ταῦθ' ὡς ἀληθῦ λένω, καὶ ὅτι οὕτε ἐδόθη ἡ ψῆφος ἐν

άπασι πλείους τ' εγένοντο των ψηφισαμένων, μάρτυρας υμίν παμέξο μαι, I will bring witnesses to show that, &c. Dem. Eubul. 1303, 2.

Έρωτα τί βούλονται, he asks what they want; ἐρωτα τί ποιήσουσιν, he asks what they will do. Ἐρωτῶντες εὶ λησταί εἰσιν, asking whether they are pirates. Thuc. I, 5. Εὐβοιίς ὧν δ' ἔβλαστεν, οἰκ ἔχω λέγειν. Soph. Trach. 401. Εἰ ξιμπονήσεις καὶ ξυ εργάσει σκόπει. Id. Ant. 41. So Eur. Alc. 784

REMARK. It is to be noticed that indirect questions after primary tenses take the Indicative in Greek, and not the Subjunctive as in Latin. Thus, nescio quis sit, I know not who he is, in Greek is simply $\dot{a}\gamma\nuo\hat{\omega}$ τ is $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$. This does not apply to indirect questions which would require the Subjunctive in the direct form (§ 71).

2. After secondary tenses the verb may be either changed to the Optative or retained in the Indicative. The Optative is the more common form. In both Indicative and Optative, the tense used in the direct discourse must be retained. E. g.

"Ελεξεν ὅτι γράφοι (or ὅτι γράφει), he said that he was writing; i. e. he said γράφω. "Ελεξεν ὅτι γεγραφως εἴη (or ὅτι γέγραφως κἴη (or ὅτι γέγραφως), he said that he had written; i. e. he said γέγραφα. "Ελεξεν ὅτι γράψοι (or ὅτι γράψει), he said that he should write; i. e. he said γράψω. "Ελεξεν ὅτι γράψειεν (or ὅτι ἔγραψεν), he said that he had

written; i. e. he said eypaya.

(Optative.) Ἐνέπλησε φρονήματος τοὺς ᾿Αρκάδας, λέγων ὡς μόνοις μεν αὐτοις πατρίς Πελοποννησος είη, πλείστον δε των Ελληνικών Φῦλον τὸ ᾿Αρκαδικὸν εἴη, καὶ σώματα ἐγκρατέστατα ἔχοι. XEN. Hell. VII, 1, 23. (He said μόνοις μεν ύμιν.... έστι, πλείστον δε έστι, καὶ σώματα . . . έχει: these Indicatives might have been used in the place of είη, είη, and έχοι.) Ελεγε δε ὁ Πελοπίδας ὅτε 'Αργείοι καὶ 'Αρκάδες μάχη ἡττημένοι είεν ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων. Ib. VII, 1, 35. (He said ἤττηνται, which might have been retained.) So HDT. I, 83. 'Υπειπων τἄλλα ὅτι αὐτὸς τἀκεῖ πράξοι, ῷχετο, having hinted that he would himself attend to the affairs there. Thuc. I, 90. (He said τἀκεῖ πράξω, and πράξει might have been used for πράξοι. Cf. ἀποκριναμένοι ότι πέμψουσιν, from the same chapter, quoted below.) For the Future Optative in general, see § 26. 'Ο δέ είπεν ὅτι ἔσοιντο. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VII, 2, 19. (He said έσουται.) Ελεξαν ὅτι π έμψειε σφας ὁ Ἰνδων βασιλεύς, κελεύων έρωταν έξ ὅτου ὁ πόλεμος εἴη, t'rey said that the king of the Indians had sent them, commanding them to ask on what account there was war. Ib. II, 4, 7. (They said $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \mu$ -Ψεν ήμας, and the question to be asked was έκ τίνος εστίν ο πόλεμος;) "Ελεγον ότι οὖπώποθ' οὖτος ό ποταμός διαβατός γένοιτο πεζή εί μη τότε, they said that this river had never been (εγένετα) fordable cacept then. Id. An. I, 4, 18. Περικλής προηγόρευε rois 'Αθηναίοις, ότι "Αρχίδαι os ρεν οἱ ξένος εἶη, οὐ μέντοι ἐπὶ κακῷ γε τῆς πόλεως γενοιτο, λε επηουποεά that A. was his friend, but that he had not been made his "riend to the injury of the state. Thuc. II, 13. (He said ξένος μοὶ ἐστιν. οὐ μέντοι ... ἐγένετο.) So HDT. I, 25. "Εγνωσαν ὅτι κενὸς ὁ φοβος εἰη. ΧΕΝ. Απ. II, 2, 21. Προϊδόντες ὅτι ἔσοιτο ὁ πόλεμος, ἐβούλοντο τὴν Πλάταιαν προκαταλαβεῖν. ΤΗυς. II. 2. Ἐπειρώμην αὐτῷ δεικνύναι, ὅτι οἴοιτο μὲν εἶναι σοφὸς, εἵη δ' οὔ. Plat. Apol. 21 C.

(Indicative.) Ελεγον ότι έλπίζουσιν σε καὶ την πόλιν εξειν μοι χάριν, they said that they hoped, &c. Isoc. Phil. p. 87 A. § 23. (They said ελπίζομεν, which might have been changed to ελπίζοιεν.) Ήκε δ' αγγέλλων τις ώς τους πρυτάνεις ώς Ἐλάτεια κατείληπται, some one had come with the report that Elatea had been taken. Dem. Cor. 284, 21. (Here the Perf. Opt. might have been used.) Δει-νούς λόγους ἐτόλμα περὶ ἐμοῦ λέγειν, ὡς ἐγὼ τὸ πρᾶγμ' εἰμὶ τοῦτο δεδρακώς. Id. Mid. 548, 17. Αλτιασάμενος γάρ με α και λέγειν αν οκνήσεις τις, τον πατέρα ως απέκτονα έγω τον έμαυτου, κ.τ.λ. Id. Andr. 593, 14. Φανερώς είπεν ὅτι ἡ μεν πόλις σφών τετείχισται ηθη, he said that their city had already been fortified. THUC. I, 91. Αποκρινάμενοι ότι πέμψουσιν πρέσβεις, εὐθὺς ἀπήλλαξαν. Id. I, 90. (Cf. ὅτι πράξοι, quoted above from the same chapter.) "Ηιδεσαν δτι τοὺς ἀπενεγκόντας οἰκέτας έξαιτήσομεν. Dem. Onet. I, 870, 11. (Έξαιτήσοιμεν might have been used.) Ἐτόλμα λέγειν ώς ύπερ ύμων έχθρους έφ' έαυτον είλκυσε και νύν έν τοις έσχάτοις έστὶ κινδύνοις. Id. Andr. 611, 10.

(Indirect Questions.) Ἡρώτησεν αὐτὸν τί ποιοίη (or τί ποιεί), he asked him what he was doing; i. e. he asked τί ποιείς; Ἡρώτησεν αὐτὸν τί πεποιηκὼς εἴη (or τί πεποίηκεν), he asked him what he had done; i. e. he asked τί πεποίηκας; Ἡρώτησεν αὐτὸν τί ποιήσοι (or τί ποιήσει), he asked τί ποιήσεις: Ἡρώτησεν αὐτὸν τί ποιήσεις; Ἡρώτησεν αὐτὸν τί ποιήσειεν (or τί ἐποίησεν), he asked him what he had done; i. e. he asked τί ἐποίησας;

"Ηρετο, εἴ τις ἐμοῦ εἴη σοφώτερος, he asked whether any one was wiser than I. Plat. Apol. 21 A. (The direct question was ἔστι τις σοφώτερος;) "Ο τι δὲ ποιήσοι οὐ διεσήμηνε, but he did not indicate what he would do. Xen. An. II, 1, 23. (The direct question was τί ποιήσω;) 'Επειρώτα, τίνα δεύτερον μετ' ἐκείνον ἴδοι, he asked whom he had seen who came next to him. Hdt. I, 31. (The direct question was τίνα είδες;) Είρετο κόθεν λάβοι τὸν παίδα, he asked whence he had received the boy. Id. I, 116. 'Ηρώτων αὐτὸν εἰ ἀναπλεύπειεν, I asked him whether he had set sail. Dem. Polycl. 1223, 20. (The direct question was ἀνέπλευσας;)

'Ηπόρουν τί ποτε λέγει, I was uncertain what he meant. Plat. Apol. 21 B. (Here λέγοι might have been used.) Έβουλεύον θ δἶτοι τίν ἀὐτοῦ καταλείψουν σιν, they were considering the question, whom they should leave here. Dem. F. L. 378, 23. 'Ερωτώντων τινῶν λιὰ τί ἀπέθανεν, παραγγέλλειν ἐκέλευεν, κ.τ.λ. ΧΕΝ. Hell. II, 1, 4.

REMARK 1. After secondary tenses the Indicative and

Optative are equally classic; the Optative being used when the writer wishes to incorporate the quotation entirely into his own sentence, and the Indicative, when he wishes to quote it in the original words as far as the construction of his own sentence allows. The Indicative here, like the Subjunctive in final and object clauses after secondary tenses (§ 44, 2), is merely a more vivid form of expression than the Optative. We even find both moods in the same sentence, sometimes when one verb is to be especially emphasized, and sometimes when there is no apparent reason for the change. E. g.

Οὖτοι ἔλεγον ὅτι Κῦρος μὲν τέθνηκεν, 'Αριαῖος δὲ πεφευγὼς ἐνρῷ σταθμῶ εἴη, καὶ λέγοι, κ.τ.λ. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Η, 1, 3. (Here τέθνηκεν contains the most important part of the message.) Έκ δὲ τούτοι ἐπυνθάνετο ἤδη αὐτῶν καὶ ὁπόσην ὁδὸν διήλασαν, καὶ εἰ οἰκοῖτο ἡ χώρα. Ιὰ. Cyr. IV, 4, 4. Ἐτόλμα λέγειν, ὡς χρέα τε πάμπολλα ἐκτέτικεν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ καὶ ὡς πολλὰ τῶν ἐμῶν λάβοιεν. DEM. Aph. I, 828, 26. (See Rem. 2.) "Ομοιοι ἦσαν θαυμάζειν ὅποι ποτὲ τρέψονταιοὶ Ἑλληνες καὶ τί ἐν νῷ ἔχοιεν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΗ, 5, 13.

REMARK 2. The Perfect and Future were less familiar forms than the other tenses of the Optative; so that they were frequently retained in the Indicative after secondary tenses, even when the Present or the Aorist was changed to the Optative. (See the last two examples under Rem. 1.) In indirect questions the Aorist Indicative was generally retained, for a reason explained in § 21, 2, N. 1. Some writers, like Thucydides, preferred the moods and tenses of the direct form, in all indirect discourse. (See § 44, 2, Rem.)

NOTE 1. (a.) An Imperfect or Pluperfect of the direct discourse is regularly retained in the Indicative, after both primary and secondary tenses, for want of an Imperfect or Pluperfect Optative. E. g.

Ήκεν ἄγγελος λέγων ὅτι τριήρεις ἤκουε περιπλεούσας, he came saying that he had heard, &c.; i. e. he said ἤκουον. ΧΕΝ. An. I, 2, 21. ᾿Ακούσας δὲ Ξενοφῶν ἔλεγεν ὅτι ὀρθῶς ἢτιῶντο καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῖς μαρτυροίη, he said that they had accused him rightly, and that the fact itself bore witness to them; i. e. he said ὀρθῶς ἢτιᾶ σθε καὶ τὸ ἔργον ὑμῖν μαρτυρεῖ. Ib. III, 3, 12. Εἰχε γὰρ λέγειν. καὶ ὅτι μόνοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων βασιλεῖ συνεμάχοντο ἐν Πλαταιαῖς, καὶ ὅτι ὕστερον οὐδέποτε στρατεύσαιντο ἐπὶ βασιλέα (he said μόνοι συνεμαχόμεθα, ... καὶ ... οὐδέποτε ἐστρατευσάμεθα. ΧΕΝ. Hell. VII, 1, 34. Τούτων ἔκαστον ἤρόμην, ᾿Ονήτορα μὲν καὶ Τιμοκράπης, εἴ τινες εἶεν μάρτυρες δυ ἐναντίον τὴν προῖκ ἀπέδοσαν, αὐτὸν δ᾽ Ἅφοβου, εἴ τινες παρῆσαν ὅτὶ ἀπελάμβανεν, I asked each of these men, ...

Onetor and Timocrates, whether there were any witnesses before whom they had paid the dowry; and Aphobus, whether there had been any present when he received it. Dem. Onet. I, 860, 10. (The two questions were εἰσὶ μάρτυρές τινες; and παρῆσάν τινες;)

(b.) In a few cases the Present Optative is used after secondary tenses to represent the Imperfect Indicative. The Present may thus supply the want of an Imperfect Optative, as the Present Infinitive and Participle supply the want of Imperfects (§ 15, 3 and § 16, 2). This can be done only when the context makes it perfectly clear that the Optative represents an Imperfect, and not a Present. E. g.

Τὸν Τιμαγόραν ἀπέκτειναν, κατηγοροῦντος τοῦ Λέοντος ὡς οὕτε συσκηνοῦν ἐθέλοι ἑαυτῷ, μετά τε Πελοπίδον πάντα βουλεύοιτο. ΧΕΝ. Hell. VII, 1, 38. (The words of Leon were οὕτε συσκηνοῦν ἥθελέροι, μετά τε Πελ. πάντα ἐβουλεύετο.) Τὰ πεπραγμένα διηγοῦντο, ότι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς πολεμίοις πλέοιεν, τὴν δὲ ἀναίρεσιν τῶν ναναγῶν προστάξαιεν ἀνδράσιν ἱκανοῖς. Ιb. I, 7, 5. (The direct discourse was αὐτοὶ μὲν ἐπλέομεν, τὴν δὲ ἀναίρεσιν προσετάξαμεν.) Καί μοι πάντες ἀπεκρίναντο καθ' ἔκαστον, ὅτι οὐδεὶς μάρτυς παρείη, κομίζοιτο δὲ λαμβάνων καθ' ὁποσονοῦν δόοιτο ᾿Αφοβος παρ' αὐτῶν, they replied, that no witness had been present, and that Aphobus had received the money from them, taking it in such sums as he happened to want. Dem. Onet. I, 869, 12. (The direct discourse was οὐδεὶς μάρτυς παρῆν, ἐκομίζετο δὲ λαμβάνων καθ' ὁποσονοῦν δέοιτο. Παρείη contains the answer to the question εἴ τινες παρῆσαν in the preceding sentence, which is quoted as the last example under a. The Imperfect in the question prevents the Optatives used in the reply from being ambiguous.) So PLAT. Rep. IV, 439 E.

Note 2. In indirect discourse after secondary tenses, each tense of the Indicative or Optative is to be translated by its own past tense, to suit the English idiom. Thus εἶπεν ὅτι γράφοι (or γράφει) is he said that he was writing; εἶπεν ὅτι γεγραφὼς εἵη (or γέγραφεν) is he said that he had written.

In a few cases the Greek uses the same idiom as the English, and allows the Imperfect or Pluperfect to stand irregularly with on or is after a secondary tense, where regularly the Present or Perfect (Optative or Indicative) would be required. In such cases the context must make it clear that the tense represented is not an Imperfect or Pluperfect (Note 1, a). E. g.

Εν πολλή ἀπορία ἦσαν οἱ Ελληνες, ἐννοούμενοι μὲν ὅτι ἐπὶ ταις βασιλέως θύραις ἦσαν, κύκλω δὲ αὐτοῖς... πόλεις πολέμκιι ἇσαν

αγορὰν δὲ οὐδεὶς ἔτι παρέξειν ἔμελλεν, ἀπεῖχον δὲ τῆς Ἑλλάδος οὐ μεῖον ἡ μύρια στάδια,...προὐδεδώκεσαν δὲ ιὖτοὺς καὶ τ βάρβαροι, μόνοι δὲ καταλελειμμένοι ἤσαν οὐδὲ ἰππέα οὐδενα σύμμαχον ἔχοντες. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΠΙ, 1, 2. (In all these cases the direct discourse would be in the Present or Perfect Indicative.) Λέγειαι δ' αὐτὸν γνῶναι ἐψ΄ ῷ ἐχώρει, ὶ is sαἰδ that he knew for what he was coming. ΤΗυς. Ι, 134. (Here χωροίη οτ χωρεῖ would be the regular form.) Διὰ τὸν χθιζινὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὁς ἡμᾶς διεδύετ', ἐξαπατῶν καὶ λέγων ὡς ψιλαθηναιος ἢν καὶ τὰν Σάμω πρῶτος κατείποι, i. e. saying ψιλαθήναιός εἰμι καὶ τὰν Σάμω πρῶτος κατείπον. ARIST. Vesp. 283. (Here εἰμί is changed to ἦν, and not to εἴη: κατείπον could have been changed only to κατείποι.)

In these examples the principle usually observed in indirect discourse,—that the tenses employed in the quotation denote *relative* not absolute time (§ 9),—is given up, and the Imperfect and Pluperfect denote absolute time, as in causal sentences (§ 81, 1). See

\$ 81, 2, Rem.

Note 3. (a.) An indirect quotation, with its verb in the Optative after $\delta \tau \iota$ or δs , is sometimes followed by an *independent* syntence with an Optative, which continues the quotation as if it were itself dependent on the $\delta \tau \iota$ or δs . Such sentences are generally introduced by $\gamma d\rho$. E. g.

"Ήκουον δ' ἔγωγέ τινων ὡς οὐδὲ τοὺς λιμένας καὶ τὰς ἀγορὰς ἔτι δώσοιεν αὐτῷ καρποῦσθαι τὰ γὰρ κοινὰ τὰ Θετταλῶν ἀπὸ τούτων δέοι διοικεῖν, for (as they said) they must administer, &c. Dem. Ol. I, 15, 22. ᾿Απεκρίναντο αὐτῷ ὅτι ἀδύνατα σφίσιν εἴη ποιεῖν ἄ προκαλεῖται ἄνευ ᾿Αθηναίων · παίδες γὰρ σφῶν καὶ γυναῖκες παρ' ἐκείνοις εἴη σαν. ΤΗυς. II, 72. Ἦξλεγον ὅτι παντὸς ἄξια λέγοι Σεύθης 'χειμῶν γὰρ εἴη, κ.τ.λ. ΧΕΝ. Απ. VII, 3, 13.

(b.) Such independent sentences with the Optative are sometimes found even when no Optative precedes, in which case the context always contains some allusion to another's thought or expression. E. g.

Υπέσχετο τὸν ἄνδρ' 'Αχαιοῖς τόνδε δηλώσειν ἄγων' οἴοιτο μὲν μάλισθ' ἐκούσιον λαβών, εἰ μὴ θέλοι δ', ἄκοντα, i. e. he thought (as he said), &c. SOPH. Phil. 617. 'Αλλὰ γὰρ οὐδεν τι μᾶλλον ἢν ἀθάνατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἰς ἀνθρώπου σῶμα ἐλθεῖν ἀρχὴ ἢν αὐτῆ ὀλθθρου, ὥσπερ νόσος καὶ ταλαιπωρουμένη τε δὴ τοῦτον τὸν βίον ζώη, καὶ τελευτῶσά γε ἐν τῷ καλουμένω θανάτω ἀπολλύοιτο, and (according to the theory) it lives in misery, ጵc., and finally perishes in what is called death. Plat. Phaed. 95 D. (Plato is here merely stating the views of others. For the Imperfects in the first sentence, see § 11, Note 6.)

§ 71. When a question in the direct form would be expressed by an interrogative Subjunctive (§ 88), indirect

questions after primary tenses retain the Subjunctive; after secondary tenses the Subjunctive may be either changed to the same tense of the Optative or retained in its original form. E. g.

Πρὸς ἀμφότερα ἀπορῶ, ταύτην θ΄ ὅπως ἐκδῶ καὶ τἄλλ' ὑπόθεν διοικῶ, I am at a loss on both questions, how I shall give her a dowry (πῶς ταύτην ἐκδῶ;), and whence I shall pay other expenses (πόθεν τἄλλα διοικῶ;). DEM. Aph. I, 834, 18. Βουλεύομαι ὅπως σε ἀποδρῶ, I am trying to think how I shall escape you (πῶς σε ἀποδρῶ;). XEN. Cyr. I, 4, 13. Οὐκ ἔχω τί λέγω, I know not what I shall say. DEM. Phil. III, 124, 24. So in Latin, non habeo quid dicam. In AESCH. Prom. 470, οὐκ ἔχω σόφισμὶ ὅτῷ . . . ἀπαλλαγῶ may be explained on this principle as interrogative; or by \S 65, I, N. 3, as a relative clause. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ δὶ ἀπειρίαν γε οὐ φήσεις ἔχειν ὅ τι εἴπης, for it is not surely through inexperience that you will declare that you know not what to say (i. e. τί εἴπω;). DEM. F. L. 378, 4. So ὅ τι δῶ and οἶς δῶ. XEN. An. I, I, I. Τὰ δὲ ἐκπώματα οὐκ οἶδ' εἰ Χρυσάντα τούτΩ δῶ, I do not know whether I shall give them, &c. Id. Cyr. VIII, 4, 16.

Ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ μερμήριξεν, ἢ ὅ γε . . . τοὶς μὲν ἀναστήσειεν, ἱ δ ᾿Ατρείδην ἐναρίζοι, ἢὲ χόλον παύσειεν, ἐρητύσειε τε θυμόν. Il. I, 191. (The direct questions were τοὺς μὲν ἀναστήσω, ᾿Ατρείδην δὶ ἐναρίζω; — ἢὲ παύσω, ἐρητύσω τε;) Κλήρους πάλλον, ὑππότερος δὴ πρόσθεν ἀφείη χάλκεον ἔγχος, ὶ. e. they shook the lots, to decide which should first throw his spear, the question being πότερος πρόσθεν ἀφῆ; Il. III, 317. Ἐπήροντο, εἰ παραδοῖεν Κορινθίοις τὴν πόλιν, they asked whether they should give up their city, the question being παραδώμεν τὴν πόλιν; Thuc. I, 25. Ἐβουλεύοντο εἰ τὰ σκευφόρα ἐνταῦθα ἄγοιντο ἢ ἀπίοιεν ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον. ΧΕΝ. An. I, 10, 17. (So An. I, 10, 5.) Ἦπόρει ὅτι χρήσαιτο τῷ πράγματι, he was at a loss how to act in the matter, ὶ. ε. τί χρήσωμαι; Id. Hell. VII, 4, 39. Οὐ γὰρ εἴχομεν . . . ὅπως δρῶντες καλῶς πράξαιμεν, for we could not see how we should fare well, if we did it. SOPH. Ant. 272.

'Απορέοντος δε βασιλέος δ τι χρήσηται τῷ παρεόντι πρήγματι, Επιάλτης ἦλθέ οἱ ἐς λόγους. ΗDT. VII, 213. 'Ηπόρησε μεν ὁποτέρωσε διακινδυνεύση χωρήσας. ΤΗυΟ. I, 63. Οἱ Πλαταιῆς ἐβουλεύοντο εἴτε κατακαύσωσιν ὥσπερ ἔχουσιν, εἴτε τι ἄλλο χρήσωνται, whether they should burn them as they were, or deal with them in some other way. Id. II, 4. 'Απορήσαντες ὅπη καθορμίσωνται, ἐς Πρώτην τὴν νῆσον ἔπλευσαν. Id. IV, 13.

REMARK 1. The context must decide whether the Optative in indirect questions represents a Subjunctive (§ 71) or an Indicative (§ 70, 2). The distinction is especially important when the Aorist Optative is used (§ 21, 2, N. 1). See also § 74, 2, N. 1.

REMARK 2. When the leading verb is in the Optative with av,

the Optative may be used in indirect questions of this class. See examples in § 34, 3.

NOTE 1. The particle commonly used in the sense of whether in indirect questions is ϵl , which can introduce a Subjunctive, as well as an Indicative or Optative. (See Xen. Cyr. VIII, 4, 16, quoted above.) 'Eáv cannot mean whether; and when this introduces a clause resembling an indirect question, the expression is really a protasis, with an apodosis suppressed or implied (§ 53, N. 2). E. g.

Εἰ δέ σοι μὴ δοκεῖ, σκέψαι ἐὰν τόδε σοι μᾶλλον ἀρέσκη ' φημὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ τὸ νόμιμον δίκαιον εἶναι. ΧΕΝ. Μεπ. IV, 4, 12. (The meaning here is, but if that does not please you, examine, in case this shall suit you better (that then you may adopt it); and not, look to see whether this suits you better. It ἐὰν ἀρέσκη is an indirect question, it can represent no form of direct question which includes the ἄν. Even ἀρέσκη alone could not be explained as an interrogative Subjunctive, by § 88.) 'Εὰν ἀρέσκη in the passage just quoted is similar to ἐὰν ἐνδειξώμεθα in Plat. Rep. V, 455 B: Βούλει οὖν δεώμεθα τοῦ τὰ τοιαὸτα ἀντιλέγοντος ἀκολουθῆσαι ἡμῖν, ἐἀν πως ἡμεῖς ἐκείνῷ ἐνδειξώμεθα ότι οὖδέν ἐστιν ἐπιτῆδευμα ἴδιον; shall we then ask the one who makes such objections to follow us, in case we can in any way show him that, &c.? See Xen. An. II, 1, 8; and Arist. Nub. 535. (Such sentences belong under § 53, N. 2. See also § 77, 1, c.)

NOTE 2. Et $\kappa\epsilon$ with the Subjunctive in Homer sometimes forms an indirect question, representing the Epic Subjunctive with $\kappa\epsilon$ in the direct question. (See § 87, Note.) E. g.

Μένετε ὄφρα ἴδητ' αἴ κ' ὕμμιν ὑπέρσχη χεῖρα Κρονίων; are you waiting that you may see whether the son of Kronos will hold his hand to protect you? II. IV, 249. (The direct question would be ὑπέρσχη κε χεῖρα;) Here the κέ always belongs to the verb, so that this Epic construction is no authority for the supposed Attic use of ἐάν and the Subjunctive in the same sense. See Note 1.

§ 72. When the verb of the direct discourse stands with $\ddot{a}\nu$ in the Indicative or Optative (forming an apodosis), the same mood and tense are retained in indirect quotations with $\ddot{o}\tau\nu$ and $\dot{o}s$ and in indirect questions, after both primary and secondary tenses. (See § 69, 2.) E. g.

Λέγει ὅτι τοῦτο αν ἐγένετο, he says that this would have happened: ἔλεγεν ὅτι τοῦτο αν ἐγένετο, he said that this would have happened. Λέγει (οτ ἔλεγεν) ὅτι οὖτος δικαίως αν θάνοι, he says (or said) that this man would justly be put to death.

(Θεμιστοκλής) ἀπεκρίνατο, ὅτι οὕτ' ἃν αὐτὸς Σερίφιος ὧν ὀπομαστὸς ἐγένετο οὕτ' ἐκεῖνος ᾿Αθηναῖος, he replied that he should not have

157

recome famous himself if he had been a Seriphian, nor would the other f he had been an Athenian. Plat. Rep. I, 330 A. Έννοεῖτε, ὅτε γτον ἄν στάσις εἴη ἐνὸς ἄρχοντος ἢ πολλῶν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. VI, 1, 29. Απεκρίνατο, ὅτι πρόσθεν ᾶν ἀπο θ άνοι εν ἢ τὰ ὅπλα παραδοίησαν. Το. II, 1, 10. (The direct discourse was πρόσθεν ᾶν ἀπο θ άνοι μεν.) Παρελθών τις δειξάτω, ὡς οἱ Θετταλοὶ νῦν οἰκ ᾶν ἐλεὐθεροι γένοι ντο ἀσμενοι DΕΜ. Ol. II, 20, 18. Οὐδ' εἰδέναι φησὶ τί ᾶν τοιῶν ὑμῶν χαρίσαιτο. Id. F. L. 356, 13. Οὐκ ἔχω τίς ᾶν γενοί γαν. ΑΕSCH. Prom. 905. So 907. Ἡρώτων εἰ δοῖεν ᾶν τούτωι τὰ πιστά. ΧΕΝ. Απ. IV, 8, 7.

Note. The same rule applies when a secondary tense of the Indicative in apodosis with $\tilde{a}\nu$ omitted (§ 49, 2, N. 2) is quoted. E. g.

(Έλεγεν) ὅτι κρεῖττον ἢ ν αὐτῷ τότε ἀποθανεῖν, he said that it were better for him to die at once. Lys. X, p. 117, § 25. (The direct discourse was κρεῖττον ἢ ν μοι.)

§ 73. 1. When the Infinitive is used in the indirect quotation of a simple sentence, which had its verb in the Indicative (with or without $\tilde{a}\nu$) or the Optative (with $\tilde{a}\nu$), the verb is changed in the quotation to the same tense of the Infinitive, after both primary and secondary tenses. If $\tilde{a}\nu$ was used in the direct discourse, it must be retained with the Infinitive.

The Present and Perfect Infinitive here represent the Imperfect and Pluperfect (as well as the Present and Perfect) Indicative. (§ 15, 3; § 18, 3, Rem.) E. g.

Φησὶ γράφειν, he says that he is writing; ἔφη γράφειν, he said that he was writing; φήσει γράφειν, he will say that he is (then) writing. (The direct discourse is here $\gamma \rho \dot{a} \phi \omega$.) Φησὶ (ἔφη) γράφειν αν, εὶ ἐδύνατο, he says (or said) that he should now be writing, if he were able. (He says ἔγραφον ἄν.) Φησὶ (ἔφη) γράφειν αν, εὶ δύναιτο, he says (or said) that he should write, if he should (ever) be able. (He says γράφοιμι αν.)

Φησὶ γράψαι, he says that he wrote; ἔφη γράψαι, he said that he had written; φήσει γράψαι, he will say that he wrote. (He says ἔγραψα. See § 23, 2.) Φησὶ (ἔφη) γράψαι ἃν, εὶ ἐδυνήθη, he says (or said) that he should have written, if he had been able. (He says ἔγραψα ἄν.) Φησὶ (ἔφη) γράψαι ἃν, εὶ δυνηθείη, he says (or said) that he should write, if he should (ever) be able. (He says γράψαι μι ἄν.)

Φησί (φήσει) γεγραφέναι, he says (or will say) that he has written; ἔψη γεγραφέναι, he said that he had written. (He says γέγραφα.) For the Perfect with ἄν, see below.

Φησὶ (φήσει) γράψειν, he says (or will say) that he will write; έφη γράψειν, he said that he would write. (He says γράψω)

(Present.) 'Αρρωστεῖν προφασίζεται, he pretends that he is sick. Έξωμοσεν ἀρρωστεῖν τουτονί, he took his oath that this man was sick. Dem. F. L. 379, 15 and 17. Οὐκ ἔφη αὐτὸς ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνον στρατηγεῖν, he said that not he himself, but Nicias, was general; i. e. he said, οὐκ ἐγὰ αἰτὸς ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος στρατηγεῖ. Thuc. IV, 28 τίνας ποτ ἐὐχὰς ὑπολαμβάνετ' εὕχεσθαι τὸν Φίλιππον ὅτ' ἔσπενδεν; what prayers do you suppose Philip made, &c.? Dem. F. L. 381, 10. (Εὕχεσθαι here represents ηὕχετο: for other examples of the Imperfect, see § 15, 3.) Οἶμαι γὰρ ᾶν οὐκ ἀχαρίστως μοι ἔχειν, for I think it would not be a thankless labor; i. e. οὖκ ᾶν ἔχοι. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Π, 3, 18. Οἶεσθε γὰρ τὸν πατέρα....οὖκ ᾶν ψυλάττειν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν λαμβάνειν τῶν πωλουμένων ξύλων, do you think that he would not have taken care and have received the pay, &c.? i. e. οὖκ ᾶν ἐψόλαττεν καὶ ἐλάμβανεν; Dem. Timoth. 1194, 20. (See § 41, 1.)

(Åorist.) Κατασχεῖν φησι τούτους, he says that he detained them. Toùs δ' αἰχμαλώτους οὐδ' ἐνθυμηθῆναί φησι λύσασθαι, but he says that he did not even think of ransoming the prisoners. DEM. F. L. 353, 14 and 18. (He says κατέσχον, and οὐδ' ἐνεθυμήθην.) Ό Κῦρος λέγεται γενέσθαι Καμβύσεω, Cyrus is said to have been the son of Cambyses. XEM. Cyr. I, 2, 1. Τοὺς 'Αθηναίους ῆλπιζεν ἴσως ᾶν ἐπεξελθεῖν καὶ τὴν γῆν οὐκ ᾶν περιιδεῖν τμηθῆναι, he hoped that the Athenians would perhaps march out, and not allow their land to be laid waste; i. e. ἴσως ᾶν ἐπεξέλθοιεν καὶ οὐκ ᾶν περιίδοιεν. ΤΗυΟ. II, 20. 'Απήεσαν νομίσαντες μὴ ᾶν ἔτι ἰκανοί γενέσθὰι κωλῦσαι τὸν τειχισμόν. Id. VI, 102. (Here οὐκ ᾶν γενοίμεθα would be the direct form. (See § 69, 5.) So 1, 139. Οὖκ ᾶν ἡγεῖσθ' αὐτὸν κᾶν ἐπιδραμεῖν, do you not believe that (in that cuse) he would have run thither? i. e. οὐκ ᾶν ἐπέδραμεν; DEM. Aph. I, 831, 12. (See § 41, 3.)

(Perfect.) Φησὶν αὐτὸς αἴτιος γεγενῆ σθαι, he says, αἴτιος γεγενημαι. Dem. F. L. 352, 26. Εἴκαζον ἡ διώκοντα οἴχεσθαι ἡ καταληψόμενών τι προεληλακέναι. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Ι, 10, 16. (Their thought was ἡ διώκων οἴχεται, ἡ . . . προελήλακεν. See § 10, N. 4.) "Εφη χρήμαθ' έαυτῷ τοῦς Θηβαίους ἐπικεκηρυχέναι, he said that the Thebans had offered a reward for him. Dem. F. L. 347, 26. For examples of the Perfect Infinitive with ἄν, representing the Pluperfect Indicative and the Perfect Optative, see § 41, 2.

(Future.) Έπαγγέλλεται τὰ δίκαια ποιήσειν, he promises to do what is right. Dem. F. L. 356, 10. So II. I, 161. "Εφη έντὸς ἡμερῶν εἴκοσιν ἡ ἄξειν Λακεδαιμονίους ζῶντας ἡ αὐτοῦ ἀποκτενεῖν, he said that within twenty days he would either bring them alive or kill them where they were. Thuc. IV, 28. (Cleon said ἡ ἄξω... ἡ ἀποκτενῶ.) Ταῦτα (φησὶ) πεπράξεσθαι δυοῖν ἡ τριῶν ἡμερῶν, he says that this will have been accomplished within two or three days. Dem. F. L. 364, 18. (See § 29, Note 6.) For the rare Future Infinitive with ἄν, see § 41, 4.

REMARK. For the meaning of each tense of the Infinitive in indirect discourse, see § 15, 2; § 18, 3; § 23, 2; and § 27. It will

159

be seen that these tenses (especially the Aorist) in this use differ essentially from the same tenses in other constructions; it is therefore important to ascertain in each case to which class the Infinitive celongs. This must be decided by the context; but in general it may be stated that an Infinitive stands in indirect discourse, when it depends upon a verb implying thought or the expression of thought, and when also the thought, as originally conceived, would have been expressed by some tense of the Indicative (with or without an) or of the Optative (with $a\nu$), which can be transferred without change of tense to the Infinitive. (See § 15, 2, N. 1, which applies only to the Infinitive without av.) Thus $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ $a \dot{v} \dot{\tau} \dot{o} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \dot{\epsilon} \hat{\iota} \nu$ means I say that de came; but βούλεται έλθεῖν means he wishes to come, where έλθεῖν is merely an ordinary Infinitive, belonging under § 23, 1. In the former case ἐλθεῖν represents ἢλθεν, but in the latter case it represents no form of the Aorist Indicative or Optative, and is therefore not in indirect discourse. So with the Infinitive after all verbs of commanding, advising, wishing, and others enumerated in § 92, 1.

2. When the Participle with the sense of the Infinitive (§ 113) is used in the indirect quotation of a simple sentence, it follows the rules already given for the Infinitive (§ 73, 1), in regard to its tense and the use of $\tilde{a}\nu$. E. g.

'Αγγέλλει τούτους ἐρχομένους, he announces that they are coming; ἤγγειλε τούτους ἐρχομένους, he announced that they were coming. (The announcement is οὖτοι ἔρχονται.) 'Αγγέλλει τούτους ἐλ θόντας, he announces that they came; ἤγγειλε τούτους ἐλ θόντας, he announced that they had come. (The announcement is ἦλθον.) 'Αγγέλλει τούτους ἐλ ηλυθότας, he announces that they are come; ἤγγειλε τούτους ἐλ ηλυθότας, he announced that they were come. (The announcement is ἐλ ηλύθασιν.) 'Αγγέλλει (ἤγγειλε) τοῦτο γενησόμενον, he announces (or announced) that this is (or was) about to happen. (He announces τοῦτο γενήσεται.)

Τοις τε γὰρ ἐπιχειρήμασιν ἑώρων οὐ κατορ θοῦντες καὶ τοὺς στρατώτας ἀχθομένους τῆ μονῆ, they saw that they were not succeeding, and that the soldiers were distressed; i. e. they saw, οὐ κατορ θοῦμεν καὶ οἱ στρατιώναι ἄχθονται. Thuc. VII, 47. Ἐμμένομεν οἷς ἀμολογήσαμεν δικαίοις οὖσιν; do we abide by what we acknowledged to θε just (i. e. δίκαιά ἐστιν)? Plat. Crit. 50 A. Πάνθ ἔνεκα ἑαντού νοιῶν ἐξελήλεγκται, he has been proved to be doing everything for his sum interest. Dem. Ol. II, 20, 12. Αὐτῷ Κῦρον στρατεύοντα πρῶτος ἤγγειλα, I first announced to him that Cyrus was marching against him. Xen. An. II, 3, 19. See Soph. O. T. 395.

Έπιστάμενοι καὶ τὸν βάρβαρον αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῷ τὰ πλείω σφαλέντα, καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς τοὺς Αθηναίους πολλὰ ἡμᾶς ἤδη τοῖς άμαρτήμασιν αὐτῶν μᾶλλον ἡ τῷ ἀφ' ὑμῶν τιμωρία περιγεγενημένους. ΤΗυς. Ι, 69. (The direct discourse would be ὁ βάρβαρος . . . εσφάλη, καὶ ἡμεῖς . . . περιγεγενήμεθα.) So in the same chapter, τον Μηδον αυτοί ζομεν έκ πειράτων γης έπι την Πελοπόννησον έλθόντα, i. e. ο Μήδος ήλθεν. Οὐ γὰρ ήδεσαν αὐτὸν τε θνηκότα, for they did not know that he was dead (i. e. τέθνηκεν). XEN. An. I, 10, 16. Έπεδειξα οὐδεν άληθες άπηγγελκότα άλλα Φενακίσαν θ' ύμας, I have shown that he has reported nothing that is true, and that he deceived (Perf. and Aor.) DEM. F. L. 396, 30.

Εἰ εὖ ήδειν καὶ τὴν συμμαχίαν μοι γενησομένην, if I were sure that I should obtain an alliance also (i. e. συμμαχία μοι γενήσεται). Ib. 353, So XEN. Hell. IV, 7, 3. 'Ο δ' ἀντοφείλων ἀμβλύτερος, είδως οὐκ ές γάριν άλλ' ές ο φείλημα την άρετην άποδώσων, knowing that he shall return the benefit, &c. THUC. II, 40. Γνόντες ούτ' ἀποκωλύσειν δυνατοὶ ὄντες, εἴ τ' ἀπομονωθήσονται τῆς ξυμβάσεως, κινδυνεύσοντες, ποιοῦνται όμολογίαν. Id. III, 28. (The direct discourse would be

ούτε δυνατοί έσμεν, εί τ' απομονωθησόμεθα, κινδυνεύσομεν.)

Εὐ δ' ἴσθι μηδέν ἄν με τούτων ἐπιχειρήσαντα σε πείθειν, εἰ δυναστείαν μόνον ή πλούτον έώρων έξ αύτων γενησόμενον. Isoc. Phil. p. 109 B. § 133 (Here μηδέν αν ἐπιχειρήσαντα represents οὐδέν αν επεχείρησα, § 69, 5; and γενησόμενον represents γενήσεται.) Σκοπούμενος οὖν ευρισκον οὐδαμῶς αν άλλως τοῦτο διαπραξάμενος, I found that I could accomplish this ($\delta_{lampa}\xi_{alunv}$ av) in no other way. Id. Antid. p. 311 C. § 7.

"Όπως δέ γε τοὺς πολεμίους δύναισθε κακῶς ποιείν, οὖκ οἶσθα μανθάνοντας ύμας πολλάς κακουργίας, do you not know that you learned, &c. Xen. Cyr. I, 6, 28. (Here the Optative δύναισθε, as well as the whole context, shows that μανθάνοντας represents έμανθάνετε, § 16, 2.) Μέμνημαι δὲ ἔγωγε καὶ παῖς ὧν Κριτία τῷδε ξυνόντα σε, Ι remember that you were with this Critics. PLAT. Charm. 156 A. (Συνόντα represents ξυνησθα.) See § 16, 2, and the examples.

Indirect Quotation of Compound Sentences.

- § 74. When a compound sentence is to be indirectly quoted, its leading verb is expressed according to the rules given for simple sentences (§§ 70-73).
- 1. If the quotation depends on a primary tense, all the dependent verbs of the original sentence retain the moods and tenses of the direct discourse.

If the quotation depends on a secondary tense, all dependent verbs of the original sentence which in the direct discourse stood in the Present, Perfect, or Future Indicative, or in any tense of the Subjunctive, may (at the pleasure of the writer) either be changed to the

same tenses of the Optative, or retain both the moods and tenses of the direct discourse. The Optative is the more common form. E. g.

(After primary tenses.) * Av δ' $\dot{\nu}\mu\epsilon\hat{\iota}s$ $\lambda \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\eta\tau\epsilon$, $\pi o \iota \dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$ ($\phi\eta\sigma\hat{\iota}$) δ μήτ' αλσχύνην μήτ' αδοξίαν αὐτῶ Φέρει. DEM. F. L. 354, 8. (Here no change is made, except from ποιήσει to ποιήσειν.) Νομίζω γὰο, αν τουτ' ακριβως μάθητε, μαλλον ύμας τούτοις μεν απιστήσειν εμοί δε βοηθήσειν. Id. Onet. I, 870, 27. Έλν εκείνο είδωμεν, ότι απαντα όσα πώποτ' ή λ πίσα μέν τινα πράξειν ύπερ ήμων καθ' ήμων εθρηται, . . καν μη νυν έθέλωμεν έκει πολεμείν αυτώ, ένθάδ ίσως άναγκασθησόμεθα τοῦτο ποιείν, κ. τ λ. Id. Phil. I, 54, 18. Προλέγω ότι, όπότερ' αν άποκρίνηται, έξελεγχθήσεται. PLAT. Euthyd. 275 E. See Dem. Mid. 536, 1, where two such conditional sentences depend on εί πρίδηλον γένοιτο. (See § 34, 3.)

Ορώ σοι τούτων δεήσων, όταν έπιθυμήσης Φιλίαν πρός τινας ποιείσθαι. ΧΕΝ. Mem. II, 6, 29. Παράδειγμα σαφές καταστήσατε, δι αν άφιστηται, θανάτω ζημιωσόμενον. ΤΗυς. ΙΙΙ, 40.

\$ 73, 2.

(Opt. after secondary tenses.) Είπε ὅτι ἄνδρα ἄγοι ὃν εἶρξαι δ έοι he said that he was bringing a man whom it was necessary to confine i. e. he said ἄνδρα ἄγω ον είρξαι δεί. ΧΕΝ. Hell. V, 4, 8. κρίνατο ότι μανθάνοιεν οἱ μανθάνοντες α οὐκ ἐπίσταιντο, i. e. h replied, μανθάνουσι α οὐκ ἐπίστανται. Plat. Euthyd. 276 E. (Here a has a definite antecedent, § 59, and is not conditional; it takes the Optative only because it is in indirect discourse. So with $\delta \nu$ in the preceding example.) 'Αγησίλαυς έλεγεν ὅτι, εἰ βλαβερὰ πεπραχώς είη, δίκαιος είη ζημιουσθαι, i. e. he said ci βλαβερά πέπραχε, δίκαιός εστι (ημιούσθαι. XEN. Hell. V, 2, 32. So An. VI, 6, 25.

Εί δέ τινα φεύγοντα λήψοιτο, προηγόρευει ὅτι ὡς πολεμίω χρή σοιτο. Id. Cyr. III. 1, 3. (This is a quotation of a conditional sentence belonging under § 50, 1, N. 1; εί τινα λήψομαι, ... χρήσο μαι.) Γνόντες δε . . . ὅτι, εἰ δώσοιεν εὐθύνας, κινευιείσοιε! ἀπολέσθαι, πέμπουσιν καὶ διδάσκουσιν τοὺς Θηβαίους ὡς, εἰ ψη στρατεύσοιεν, κινδυνεύσοιεν οί 'Αρκάδες πάλιν λακωνίσαι. Id. Heli VII, 4, 34. (See § 32, 2.) "Ηιδει γὰρ ὅτι, εἰ μάχης ποτὲ δήσοι, έν τούτων αὐτῷ παραστάτας ληπτέον εἴη. Id. Cyr. VIII, 1, 10. (The direct discourse was εἴ τι δεήσει, . . . ληπτέον ἐστίν.)

'Ελογίζοντο ώς, εἰ μὴ μάχοιντο, ἀποστήσοιντο αἱ περιοικίδε: πόλεις. Id. Hell. VI, 4, 6. (Ἐὰν μὴ μαχώμεθα, ἀποστήσονται.) Χρήμαθ' ὑπισχνεῖτο δώ σειν, εὶ τοῦ πράγματος αὶτιῶντο ἐμέ. ΣΕΜ. Mid. 548, 20. (Δώσω, έὰν αἰτιᾶσθε) Ἡγεῖτο γὰρ ἄπαν ποιήσειν αὐτὸν, εἴ τις ἀργύριον διδοίη. Lys. in Erat. p. 121, § 14. Εὔξαντο σωτήρια θύσειν, ένθα πρώτον είς φιλίαν γην άφίκοιντο. ΧΕΝ. Απ. V, 1, 1. (The dependent clause is found in the direct discourse in III 2, 9: δοκεί μοι εύξασθαι τῷ θεῷ τούτῳ θύπειν σωτήρια ὅπου αν πρῶτον είς φιλίαν γην άφικώ με θα.) Τοῦτο ἐπραγματεύετο νομίζων, ὅσα της πόλεως προλάβοι, πάντα ταῦτα βεβαίως έξειν. DEM. Cor. 234, 5 ("Οσ' αν προλάβω, βεβαίως έξω.) "Ηλπιζον ύπο των παίδων, έπειδι

τελευτήσειαν τὸν βίον, ταφήσεσθαι. Lys. Agor. p. 183, § 45. (Ἐπειδὰν τελευτήσωμεν, ταφησόμεθα.) Κόνων ἐδίδασκεν ὡς οὕτω μὲν ποιοῦντι πάσαι αὐτῷ αἱ πόλεις φιλίαι ἔσοιντο, εἰ δὲ δουλοῦσθαι βουλόμενος φανερὸς ἔσοιτο, ἔλεγεν ὡς μία ἐκάστη πολλὰ πράγματα ἱκανὴ εἴη παρέχειν, καὶ κίνδυνος εἴη μὴ καὶ οἱ ελληνες, εἰ ταῦτα

αισθοιντο, συσταίεν. ΧΕΝ. Hell. IV, 8, 2.

ἕτι δὲ γιγνώσκειν ἔφασαν φθονοῦντας μὲν αὐτοὺς, εἶ τι σφίσιν ἀγαθὸν γίγνοιτο, ἐφηδομένους δ΄, εἶ τις συμφορὰ προσπίπτοι, they said they knew that they were envious if any good came to them, but pleased if any calamity befell them. Th. V, 2, 2. (Φθονεῖτ ε μὲν, ἐἀν τι ἡμῖν ἀγαθὸν γίγνηται, ἐφήδεσθε δ΄, ἐἀν τις συμφορά προσπίπτη. See § 51.) Τὴν αἰτίαν, ἡ πρόδηλος ἡν ἐπ ἐκείνους ἡξουσα, εἴ τι πάθοι Χαρίδημος. DEM. Aristoc. 624, 20. (Ἦξει, ἐἀν τι πάθη Χαρίδημος.) See § 73, 2.

(Subj. and Indic. after secondary tenses.) "Ελεγον ὅτι ἄκρα τέ ἐστιν ἔνδον καὶ οἱ πολέμιοι πολλοὶ, οἱ παίουσιν τοὺς ἕνδον ἀνθρώπους, then said that there was a height, &c. ΧΕΝ. An. V, 2, 17.

(Here elev and malotev might have been used.)

'Εδόκει μοι ταύτη πειρασθαι σωθηναι, ἐνθυμουμένω ὅτι, ἐὰν μὲν λάθω, σωθήσομαι, κ.τ.λ. Lys. Erat. p. 121, § 15. (Here εἰ λάθοιμι, σωθησοίμην might have been used.) Φάσκων τε, ἡν σωθη οἴκαδε, κατά γε τὸ αὐτῷ δυνατὸν διαλλάξειν 'Αθηναίους καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους, ἀπέπλευσεν. ΧΕΝ. Hell. I, 6, 7. (He said ἡν σωθῶ, which might have been changed to εἰ σωθείη.) 'Υπέσχοντο αὐτοῖς, ἡν ἐπὶ Ποτίδαιαν ἴωσιν 'Αθηναίοι, ἐς τὴν 'Αττικὴν ἐσβαλεῖν. ΤΗυς. I, 58. (*Ην ἴωσιν, ἐσβαλοῦμεν.) So Thuc. I, 137. Καὶ οὐκ ἔφασαν ἰ ἐναι, ἐὰν μὴ τις αὐτοῖς χρήματα διδῷ... Ο δ' ὑπέσχετο ἀνδρὶ ἐκάστῷ δώσειν πέντε μνᾶς, ἐπὰν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ἤκωσι, καὶ τὸν μισθὸ ἐντελῆ, μέχρι ἄν καταστήση τοὺς Έλληνας εἰς Ἰωνίαν πάλιν. ΧΕΝ. Αρ. I, 4, 12 and 13. 'Έφη χρῆναι,... οἱ ᾶν ἐλεγχθῶνι διαβάλλοντες τῶν 'Ελλήνων, ὡς προδότας ὄντας τιμωρηθήναι. Ib. II, 5, 27.

Εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔφασαν αὐτῶν τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀποκτενεῖν οὐς ἔχουσιζῶντας. ΤΗυς. Η, 5. ("Εχοιεν might have been used.) Κατασχίσειν τὰς πύλας ἔφασαν, εἰμὴ ἐκόντες ἀνοίξουσιν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. VII, 1, 16. (Εὶ μὴ ἀνοίξοιεν might have been used.) Αὐτοῖς τοιαὐτοδέςα παρειστήκει, ὡς, εἰ μὲν πρότερον ἐπ' ἄλλην πόλιν ἴασιν, ἐκείνοις καὶ ᾿Αθηναίοις πολεμ μὸ σουσιν · εἰ δ' ἐνθάδε πρῶτον ἀφὶξονται, οὐδένας ἄλλους τολμήσειν, κ.τ.λ. Lys. Or. Fun. p. 192, § 22. (Τοῦτο) πρόδηλον ἢν ἐσόμενον, εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς κωλύσετε, ὰ was already manifest that this would be so, unless you should prevent ừ (i. e. ἔσται, εἰ μὴ κωλύσετε). ΑΕΒCHIN. Cor. § 90. (Κωλύσοιτε might be used; and κωλύσαιτε, representing ἐὰν μὴ κωλύστε, is found in one Ms. and many editions.) See § 73, 2.

7. 1 m

NOTE 1. The dependent verbs in indirect discourse may be changed to the Optative, even when the leading verb retains the Indicative; and sometimes (though rarely) a dependent verb retains the Subjunctive or Indicative, when the leading verb is changed to the Optative. This often gives rise to a great variety of constructions in the same sentence. E. g.

Δηλώσας ότι έτοιμοί είσι μάχεσθαι, εί τις εξέρχοιτο. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. IV, 1, 1. (Ετοιμοί είσιν, εάν τις εξέρχηται.) Λύσανδρος είπε ότι παρασπόνδους ύμας έχοι, καὶ ότι οὐ περὶ πολιτείας ὑμῖν ἔσται άλλα περί σωτηρίας, εί μή ποιήσαιθ ά Θηραμένης κελεύοι. Lys. in Erat. p. 127, § 74. ("Εχω, καὶ οὐ . . . ἔσται, ἐὰν μὴ ποιήσηθ' å Θ. κελεύει. There is no need of the emendations ποιήσετ' and κελεύει.) Έδόκει δήλον είναι ότι αίρήσονται αὐτὸν, εί τις ἐπιψηφίζοι. ΧΕΝ. Απ. VI, 1, 25. Οὐκ ἡγνόει Εὐβουλίδης ὅτι, εἰ λόγος ἀποδοθήσοιτο, καὶ παραγένοιντό μοι πάντες οι δημόται, καὶ ἡ ψῆφος δικαίως δοθείη, ούδαμοῦ γενήσονται οι μετά τούτου συνεστηκότες. DEM. Eubul. 1303, 22. (Εἰ ἀποδοθήσεται, καὶ ἐὰν παρανένωνται, καὶ ψηφος δοθη, οὐδαμοῦ γενήσονται.) 'Αγησίλαος γνούς ὅτι, εἰ μὲν μηδετέρω συλλή ψοιτο, μισθον οὐδέτερος λύσει τοις Ελλησιν, αγοράν δε οὐδέτερος παρέξει, ὁπότερος τ' αν κρατήση, οδτος έχθρὸς ἔσται εἰ δὲ τῷ ἐτέρῳ συλλήψοιτο, οὖτός γε φίλος ἔσοιτο, κ.τ.λ. XEN. Ages. II, 31.

*Ελεγον ὅτι εἰκότα δοκοῖεν λέγειν βασιλεῖ, καὶ ἢκοιεν ἡγημόνας έχοντες, οι αὐτοὺς, ἐὰν σπονδαὶ γένωνται, ἄξουσιν ἔνθεν ἔξουσι τὰ ἐπιτήδεια. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙ, 3, 6. Ἐπηρώτα, ποῖα εἴη τῶν ὀρέων όπόθεν οι Χαλδαίοι καταθέοντες ληίζονται. Id. Cyr. III, 2. 1. Τούτοις προύλεγον, ότι είρων εύσοιο καὶ πάντα μάλλον ποιήσοις ή άποκρινοίο, εί τίς τί σε έρωτά. ΡιΑΤ. Rep. I, 337 A. (Ερωτά in the direct discourse would belong under § 51, N. 3, the Futures denoting a habit.) "Ελεξας ὅτι μέγιστον εἴη μαθεῖν ὅπως δεῖ ἐξεργίγνεσθαι, εἰ μή τις ἐπίσταιτο α΄ δεῖ καὶ ως δεῖ ποιεῖν. ΧΕΝ. Occon. XV, 2.

In Dem. Cor. 276, 23, we have both the constructions of § 74, 1 in the same sentence: εὶ μὲν τοῦτο τῶν ἐκείνου συμμάχων εἰσηγοῖτό τις, ὑπόψεσθαι τὸ πράγμα ἐνόμιζε πάντας, ἃν δ΄ Αθηναίος η ὁ τοῦτο ποιών, εὐπόρως λήσειν. (Here εἰ εἰσηγοῖτο represents ἐὰν εἰση-

γηται, corresponding to έαν ή.)

Note 2. According to the general rule (§ 69, 4), all relatives and particles which take av and the Subjunctive lose the av when such Subjunctives are changed to the Optative in indirect discourse after secondary tenses. In a few cases, however, the au is irregularly retained, even after the verb has been changed to the Opta-This must not be confounded with av belonging to the Optative itself, making an apodosis. E. g.

Οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅστις οὐχ ἡγείτο τῶν εἰδότων δίκην με λήψεσθαι παρ' αὐτων, επειδάν τάχιστα άνηρ είναι δοκιμασθείην. Dem. Onet. I, 865, 24. (The direct discourse was ἐπειδὰν δοκιμασθή, and the regular indirect form would be either ἐπειδή δοκιμασθείην οτ ἐπειδάν δοκιμασθώ. Here the verb is changed, while the original particle

ἐπειδάν is retained.) See also § 77, 1, Note 3.

2. The Imperfect and Pluperfect remain in the Indicative unchanged, even after secondary tenses, in the dependent (as well as in the leading) clauses of indirect discourse, from the want of those tenses in the Optative. (§ 70, 2, Note 1, a.)

The Aorist Indicative also regularly remains unchanged after secondary tenses, when it stood in a dependent clause of the direct discourse; not being changed to the Aorist Optative (as it may be when it stood in the leading clause, § 70, 2). E. g.

Ἐπιστείλαι δὲ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς τοὺς ἐφόρους (ἔφασαν) εἰπεῖν, ὡς ὧν μὲν πρόσθεν ἐποίουν μέμφοιντο αὐτοῖς, that they sent them to say that they blamed them for what they had done before; i. e. ὧν πρόσθεν

έποιείτε μεμφόμεθα ύμιν. ΧΕΝ. Hell. III, 2, 6.

Note 1. The Aorist Indicative is not changed to the Aorist Optative in the case just mentioned, as the latter tense in such dependent clauses generally represents the Aorist Subjunctive of the direct discourse, so that confusion might arise. Thus $\tilde{\epsilon}\phi\eta$ \hat{a} $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\nu}\rho o \epsilon$ $\delta \hat{\omega}\sigma\epsilon \nu$ means he said that he would give whatever he might find (\hat{a} $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\nu}\rho o \nu$, it might also mean he said that he would give what he actually had found. In the leading clause the ambiguity is confined to indirect questions; and in these the Aorist Indicative is generally retained for the same reason. (See § 70, 2, Rem. 2.)

When no ambiguity can arise from the change of an Aorist In-

When no ambiguity can arise from the change of an Aorist Indicative to the Optative, this tense may follow the general principle (§ 69, 1), even in dependent clauses of a quotation. This occurs chiefly in causal sentences after ort, &c., because (§ 81, 2), in which

the Subjunctive can never be used. E. g.

Εἶχε γὰρ λέγειν ὡς Λακεδαιμόνιοι διὰ τοῦτο πολεμήσειαν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι οὐκ ἐθελήσαιεν μετ' Αγησιλάου ἐλθεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν οὐδὲ θῦσαι ἐάσσειαν αὐτὸν ἐν Αὐλίδι. ΧΕΝ. Hell. VII, 1. 34. (The direct discourse was ἐπολέμησαν ἡμῖν, ὅτι οὐκ ἡ θελήσαμεν... οὐδὲ θῦσαι εἰάσα μεν.) ᾿Απηγήσασθαί (φασι) ὡς ἀνοσιώτατον μὲν εἴη εἰργασμένος ὅτε τοῦ ἀδελφεοῦ ἀποτάμοι τὴν κεφαλὴν, σοφώτατον δὲ ὅτι τοὺς φιλάκους κυταμεθύσας καταλύσειε τοῦ ἀδελφεοῦ κρεμάμενον τὸν νέκυν ΗρΓ

II, 121. (Here ὅτι καταλύσειε represents ὅτι κατέλυσα, because I took down; ὅτε ἀποτάμοι (so the Mss.) may also be understood in a causal sense, since he had cut off. Madvig, however, reads ὅτι in both clauses.) See also § 77, 1, e, and examples.

NOTE 2. The Imperfect or Pluperfect sometimes stands irregularly in a dependent (as well as in the leading) clause, after a secondary tense, to represent a Present or Perfect Indicative, which would regularly be retained or changed to the Present or Perfect Optative.

Such clauses really abandon the construction of indirect discourse. (See § 70, 2, N. 2; § 77, 1, N. 2.) E. g.

"Ελεγον οὐ καλῶς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐλευθεροῦν αὐτὸν, εἰ ἄνδρας διέφθει-ρεν οὕτε χεῖρας ἀνταιρομένους οὕτε πολεμίους. ΤΗυς. ΗΙ, 32. (Οὐ καλῶς ἐλευθεροῖς, εἰ διαφθείρεις.) Οὕτε γὰρ τοῖς θεοῖς ἔφη καλῶς ἔχειν, εἰ ταῖς μεγάλαις θυσίαις μὰλλον ἢ ταῖς μικραῖς ἔχαιρον. ΧΕΧ. Μεm. Ι, 3, 3. (Εἰ χαίρουσιν.) Καὶ ἔφη εἶναι παρ' ἐαυτῷ ἄσον μὴ ἢ ν ἀνηλωμένον. DEM. Olymp. 1172, 1. ("Οσον μή ἐστιν ἀνηλωμένον.) Α μὲν εἰλήφει τῆς πόλεως ἀποδώσειν (ἡγούμην), I thought that he would give back what he had taken from the city; i. e. å εἴληφεν ἀποδώσει. Id. F. L. 388, 17.

\$ 75. When a dependent clause of the original sentence contains a secondary tense of the Indicative implying the non-fulfilment of a condition, the same mood and tense are retained in the indirect discourse, after both primary and secondary tenses. E. g.

Έδόκει, εἰ μὴ ἔφ θασαν ξυλλαβόντες τοὺς ἄνδρας, προδοθῆναι ἃν τὴν πόλιν. Thuc. VI, 61. (If ἔφθασαν had been changed to the Optative, the construction would have become that of § 76.) Οἴεσθε τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ Τιμοθέου ἢν τὰ ξύλα καὶ ἐδεἡ θη οὖτος αὐτοῦ . . . παρασχεῖν τὸ ναυλον, ἐωσαι ἄν ποτε, κ.τ.λ., ἀλλὶ οὐκ ἃν φυλάττειν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν λαμβάνειν, ἔως ἐκομίσατο τὰ ἐαντοῦ. Dem. Timoth. 1194, 13. Τούτων εἰ τι ἢν ἀληθὲς, οἴεσθ οὐκ ἃν αὐτὴν λαβεῖν; Id. Aph. I, 831, 5. 'Ηδέως ἃν ὑμῶν πυθοίμην, τίν ἄν ποτε γνώμην περὶ ἐμοῦ εἴχετε, εἰ μὴ ἐπετριηράρχησα ἀλλὰ πλέων ῷχόμην. Id. Polycl. 1227, 2.

§ 76. An Optative in a dependent clause of the original sentence (as in the leading clause) is retained without change of mood or tense in all indirect discourse. E. g.

Εἶπεν ὅτι ἔλθοι ἀν εἰς λόγους, εἰ ὁμήρους λάβοι. ΧΕΝ. Hell. ΠΙ, 1, 20. Ἦττον ἀν διὰ τοῦτο τυγχάνειν (δοκεῖ μοι), εἴ τι δέοισθε παρ αὐτῶν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. VI, 1, 26. Ἐλεγεν ὅτι οὐκ ἄν ποτε προοῖτο, ἐπεὶ ἄπαξ φίλος αὐτῶς ἐγένετο, οὐδ' εὶ ἔτι μὲν μείους γένοιντο ἔτι δὲ κά·

κιον πράξειαν. Το. Ι, 9, 10. Δεινόν αν τι παθείν σαυτόν ήλπιζες, εἰ πύθοινθ' οὖτοι τὰ πεπραγμένα σοι. DEM. F. L. 416, 11.

REMARK. Sentences which belong under § 76 are often translated like those which in the direct discourse were expressed by a Future and a dependent Subjunctive, and which belong under § 74, 1. Thus ἔλεγεν ὅτι ἔλθοι ἄν, εἰ τοῦτο γένοιτο (οτ ἔλεγεν ἐλθεῖν ἄν, εἰ τοῦτο γένοιτο), as well as ἔλεγεν ὅτι ἐλεύσοιτο, εἰ τοῦτο γένοιτο (οτ ἔλεγον ἐλεύσεσθαι, εἰ τοῦτο γένοιτο), may be translated he said that he would come if this should happen; although in the first two sentences the direct discourse was ἔλθοιμι ᾶν, εἰ τοῦτο γένοιτο, I would come if this should happen; and in the last two, ἐλεύσομαι, ἐὰν τοῦτο γένηται, I will come if this shall happen.

Single Dependent Clauses in Indirect Discourse.

§ 77. The principles which apply to dependent clauses of indirect discourse (§ 74, 1 and 2) apply also to any dependent clause in a sentence of any kind (even when what precedes is not in indirect discourse), if such a clause expresses *indirectly* the thought of any other person than the speaker, or even a former thought of the speaker himself.

After primary tenses this never affects the construction; but after secondary tenses such a clause may either take the Optative, in the tense in which the thought would have been originally conceived, or retain both the mood and the tense of the direct discourse. Here, as in § 74, 2, the Imperfect, Pluperfect, and Aorist Indicative are retained unchanged.

1. This applies especially (a) to clauses depending on the Infinitive which follows verbs of commanding, advising, wishing, &c.; these verbs implying thought or the expression of thought, although the Infinitive after them is not in indirect discourse. (See § 73, 1, Rem.) It applies also (b) to the Optative (though not to the Indicative) in causal sentences in which the speaker states the cause as one assigned by others (81, 2) : -(c) to clauses containing a protasis with the apodosis implied in the context (§ 53, Note 2), or with the apodosis

sis expressed in a verb like $\theta av\mu a \zeta \omega$, &c. (§ 56); — (d) to temporal sentences expressing a past intention or expectation, especially those introduced by $\xi \omega_s$ and $\pi \rho i \nu$, until, after past tenses (§ 66, 2, Note 1); — and sometimes (e) even to ordinary relative sentences, which would otherwise take the Indicative. E. g.

(a.) Ἐβούλοντο ἐλθεῖν, εἰ τοῦτο γένοιτο, they wished to go, if this should happen. (Here ἐὰν τοῦτο γένηται might be used, as the form in which the wish would originally be conceived.) Γαδάταν δὲ καὶ Γωβρύαν ἐκέλευσεν ὅ τι δύναιντο λαβόντας μεταδιώκειν καὶ ὅστις εἶχε τὰς ἐπομένας ἀγέλας, εἶπε τούτω καὶ ἄμα πρόβατα πολλ ἐλαύνειν, ὅπη ὰν αὐτὸν πυν θάνηται τοντα, ὡς ἐπισφαγείη. Χεπ. Cyr. VII, 3, 7. (Here ὅ τι δύναιντο represents ὅ τι ἄν δύνησθε in the direct command, while ὅπη ἄν πυνθάνηται represents ὅπη ἄν πυνθάνη.) Ἑβούλοντο γὰρ σφίσιν, εἴ τινα λάβοιεν, ὑπάρχειν ἀντὶ τῶν ἔνδον, ἡν ἄρα τύχωσι.) Οἱ δ᾽ ἄλλοι Θηβαῖοι, οὖς ἔδει παραγενέσθαι, εἴ τι μὴ προχωρῦ.)

Προείπον αὐτοίς μὴ ναυμαχείν Κορινθίοις, ἢν μὴ ἐπὶ Κέρκυραν πλέωσι καὶ μέλλωσιν ἀποβαίνειν. Ιd. Ι, 45. (*Ην μη πλέητε καὶ μέλλητε.) Καὶ παρήγγειλαν ἐπειδή δειπνήσειαν συνεσκευασμένους πάντας άναπαύεσθαι, καὶ επεσθαι ἡνίκ' ἄν τις παραγγέλλη. ΧΕΝ. An. III, 5, 18. (Ἐπειδὰν δειπνήσητε, and ἡνίκ' ἄν τις παραγγέλλη.) Περί αὐτῶν κρύφα πέμπει, κελεύων . . . μὴ ἀφείναι πρὶν ἃν αὐτοὶ πάλιν κομισθώσιν. ΤΗUC. I, 91. (Πρὶν κομισθεῖεν might have been used.) Καὶ πολλάκις τοις 'Αθηναίοις παρήνει, ην άρα ποτέ κατα γην βιασθώσι, καταβάντας ές αὐτὸν ταῖς ναυσὶ πρὸς ἄπαντας ἀνθίστασθαι. Id. I, 91. (Εἰ βιασθεῖεν might have been used.) Ἡξίουν αὐτοὺς ήγεμόνας σφών γενέσθαι καὶ Παυσανία μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν, ήν που βιάζηται. Id. I, 95. (Εἴ που βιάζοιτο might have been used.) 'Αφικνοῦνται ως Σιτάλκην, βουλόμενοι πείσαι αὐτὸν, εί δύναιντο, στρατεῦσαι έπὶ τὴν Ποτίδαιαν. Ιd. ΙΙ, 67. "Ετοιμος ἦν ἀποτίνειν, εἰ καταγνοῖεν αὐτοῦ. Isoc. Trapez. 361 E. § 16. (This example might be placed also under c.) Εἶπον μηδένα τῶν ὅπισθεν κινεῖσθαι, πρὶν ἃν ὁ πρόσθεν ηγηται, I commanded that no one, &c. XEN. Cyr. II, 2, 8.

Παρηγγέλλετο γὰρ αὐτοῖς δέκα μὲν οὖς Θηραμένης ἀπέδειξε χειρατονήσαι, δέκα δὲ οὖς οἱ ἔφοροι κελεύοιεν. Lys. in Erat. p. 127, § 76. (Οὖς ἀπέδειξε, and οὖς ἄν κελεύωσιν. See § 74, 2.) Ἐκέλευσέ με τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἢν ἔγραψα οἴκαδε δοῦναι, the letter which I had written. ΧΕΝ, Cyr. II, 2, 9. (Ἡν γράψαιμι would mean whatever letter I might write, representing ἢν ἀν γράψης.) So ὅθεν ἢλθον,

THUC. VII, 27.

(b.) Έκάκιζον ότι στρατηγός δεν οὐκ ἐπεξάγοι, they abused him because he did not lead them out (as they said). Thuc. II, 21.

See other examples under § 81, 2. See also § 81, 2, Rem.

(c.) "Ωικτειρον, εἰ ἀλώσοιντο, they pitied them, in case they

*Ην δέ τις εἶπη ἢ ἐπιψηφίση κινεῖν τὰ χρήματα ταῦτα ἐς ἄλλο τι, θάνατον ζημίαν ἐπέθεντο, they set death as the penalty, if any one should move, or put to vote a motion, to divert this money to any other purpose. ΤΗυς. ΙΙ, 24. (Εἰ εἴποι ἢ ἐπιψηφίσειεν might have been used.) Τἄλλα, ἢν ἔτι ναυμαχεῖν οἱ ᾿Αθηναῖοι τολμήσωσι, παρεσκευάζοντο, i. e. they made their other preparations, (to be ready) in case the Athenians should dare, &c. Id. VII, 59. (Their thought was, we will be ready, in case they shall dare, ἢν τολμήσωσι.) So ἢν ἴωσιν, ΙΥ, 42. Οὐ τὸ λοιπὸν ἔμελλον ἔξειν, εἰ μὴ ναυκρατή σουσιν, they were not live to have them (provisions) for the future (as they thought), unless they should hold the sea. Id. VII, 60. See Lys. Agor. p. 131, § 15.

"Εθαύμαζε δ' εἴ τις ἀρετὴν ἐπαγγελλόμενος ἀργύριον πράττοιτο, he wondered that any demanded money, &c. Xen. Mem. I, 2, 7. (But in I, 1, 13, we find ἐθαύμαζε δ' εἰ μὴ φανερὸν αὐτοῖς ἐστιν, he wondered that it was not plain.) "Εχαιρον ἀγαπῶν εἴ τις ἐά σοι, I rejoiced, being content if any one would let it pass. Plat. Rep. V, 450 A. Οὐκ ἢσχύνθη εἰ τοιοῦτο κακὸν ἐπάγει τφ, he was not ashamed that he was bringing such a calamity on any one. Dem. Mid. 548, 24. Τῷ δὲ μηδὲν ἐαυτῷ συνειδότι δεινὸν εἰσῆει, εἰ πονηρῶν ἔργων δόξει κοινωνεῖν τῷ σιωπῆσαι, it seemed hard, if he was to appear to be implicated. &c.; he thought, δεινόν ἐστιν, εἰ δόξω (§ 49, 1, N. 3). Id. F. L. 351, 18. (Here δόξοι might have been used, like ἐάσοι above.) So Aeschin. Cor. § 10. Καὶ ἐγὰ τὸν Εὐηνὸν ἐμακάρισα, εἰ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἔχει ταύτην τὴν τέχνην καὶ οῦτως ἐμμελῶς διδάσκει, I congratulated him, if he really had this art (as he thought). Plat. Apol. 20 B (Here ἔγοι and διδάσκοι might have been used.)

(d.) Σπονδὰς ἐποιήσαντο, ἔως ἀπαγγελθείη τὰ λεχθέντα εἰς Λακεδαίμονα, they made a truce, (to continue) until what had been said should be announced at Sparta; i. e. ἔως ἃν ἀπαγγελθ \hat{g} , which might have been retained. Xen. Hell. III, 2, 20. ° Ωρσε δ' ἐπὶ κραπνὰν Βορέην, πρὸ δὲ κύματ' ἔαξεν, ἔως δ γε Φαιήκεσσι φιληρέτμοισι μιγείη, until Ulysses should be among the Phaeacians; i. e. ἔως ἃν μιγ \hat{g} . Od. V, 385. So εἴως θερμαίνοιτο, Od. IX, 376. 'Απηγόρευε μηδένα βάλλειν, πρὶν Κῦρος ἐμπλησθείη θηρῶν, until Cyrus should be satisfied. Xen. Cyr. I, 4, 14. (His words were πρὶν ᾶν ἐμπλησθ \hat{g} .) Οἱ δὲ μένοντες ἔστασαν, ὁππότε πύργος 'Αχαιῶν ἀλλος ἐπελθῶν Τρώων ὁρμήσειε καὶ ἄρξειαν πολέμοιο, i. e. they stood waiting for the time when, &c. II IV, 335. (Here ὁπόταν ὀρμήση, &c. might be used.) So II. II, 794. Προὐκίνησαν τὸ στῖφος, ὡς παυσυμένους τοῦ διωγμοῦ, ἐπεὶ σφᾶς ἔδοιεν προορμήσαντας, when they should see them, &c. Xen. Cyr. I, 4, 21.

- Οἰ γὰρ δή σφεας ἀπίει ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἀποικίης, πρὶν δὴ ἀπίκωνται ἐς αὐτὴν Λιβύην. Η DT. IV, 156. (Απίκοιντο might be used.) Οἱ δὲ Κορίνθιοι οὐ προεθυμήθησαν ξυμπλεῖν, πρὶν τὰ Ἰσθμια, ὰ τότε ἦν, διεορτά τω σιν. ΤΗυΟ. VIII, 9.
- (e.) Καὶ ἦτεε σῆμα ἰδέσθαι, ὅ ττι ῥά οἱ γαμβροῖο πάρα Προίτοιο φ έροιτο, he asked to see the token, which (he said) he was bringing from Proetus, i. e. he said φέρομαι. Π. VI, 177. Κατηγόρεον τῶν Αἰγινητέων τὰ πεποιῆ κοιεν προδόντες τὴν Ἑλλάδα, i. e. they accused them for what (as they said) they had done. Hdt. VI, 49. So τὰ πεπουθώς εἶη, 1, 44. Καλεῖ τὸν Λάιον, μνήμην παλαιῶν σπερμάτων ἔχουσ΄, ὑφ՝ ὧν θάνοι μὲν αὐτὸς, τὴν δὲ τίκτουσαν λίποι, by which (as she said) he had perished himself, and had left her the mother, &c. Soph. O. T. 1245. (If the relative clause contained merely the idea of the speaker, ἔθανε and ἕλιπε would be used. Here no ambiguity can arise from the use of the Aorist Optative. 'See § 74, 2, N. 1.)
- NOTE 1. Causal sentences are usually constructed without reference to this principle. See § 81, with Rem.
- NOTE 2. The Imperfect and Pluperfect occasionally represent the Present and Perfect Indicative in this construction, as in § 74, 2, N. 2. Such clauses are simply not included in the indirect discourse. E. g.

Έτοῖμος ἢν, εἰ μὲν τούτων τι εἴργαστο, δίκην δοῦναι, εἰ δ' ἀπολυθείη, ἄρχειν, he was ready, if he had done any of these things, to be punished; but if he should be acquitted, to hold his command. Thuc. VI, 29. (Εἴργαστο represents εἴργασμαι, while εἰ ἀπολυθείη represents ἐὰν ἀπολυθῶ.)

NOTE 3. "Av is occasionally retained with relatives and temporal particles in sentences of this kind, even when the Subjunctive to which they belonged has been changed to the Optative. See § 74, 1, Note 2. E. g.

Τοὺς δὲ λαμβάνοντας τῆς όμιλίας μισθὸν ἀνδραποδιστὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀπεκάλει, διὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον αὐτοῖς εἶναι διαλέγεσθαι παρ' ὧν ἃν λάβοιεν τὸν μισθόν, because they were obliged (as he said) to converse with those from whom they received the pay. Xen. Mem. I, 2, 6. (Here ὧν ἃν λάβοιεν represents ὧν ἃν λάβωσιν.) Καί μοι τάδ' ἦν πρόρρητα, . . . τὸ φάρμακον τοῦτο σώζειν ἐμὲ, ἔως ἀν ἀρτίχριστον ἀρμόσαιμί που. Sofh. Trach. 687. (See Schneidewin's note.) 'Ήξιουν αὐτοὺς μαστιγοῦν τὸν ἐκδοθέντα, ἔως ᾶν τὰληθῆ δόξειεν αὐτοῖς λέγειν. Isoc. Trap. 361 D. § 15. Χαίρειν ἐφης ἃν καὶ οὐκ ἀποκρίναιο, ἔως ἃν τὰ ἀπ' ἐκείνης ὁρμηθέντα σκ έψ αιο, you would not answer, until you should have examined, &c. Plat. Phaed. 101 D. (The direct thought of the person addressed would be, ἔως ᾶν σκέψωμαι.) See § 34, 1.

It is doubtful whether ἐάν was ever used with the Optative in this

у

2. Upon this principle (§ 77) final and object clauses with

ίνα, ὅπως, μή, &c., after secondary tenses, admit the double construction of indirect discourse. This appears in the frequent use of the Subjunctive or the Future Indicative instead of the Optative in these sentences, after secondary tenses, when either of these is the form in which the purpose would have been originally conceived. Thus we may say either ηλθεν να δδοι or ηλθεν να δδη, he came that he might see; the latter being allowed because the person referred to would himself have said δρχομαι να δδω. See § 44, 2, § 45, and § 46, with the examples.

Note. The principles of § 74 and § 77 apply to clauses which depend upon final and object clauses, as these too are considered as standing in indirect discourse. E. g.

Έλθόντες ἐς Λακεδαίμονα (ἔπρασσον) ὅπως ἐτοιμάσαιντο τιμωρίαν, ἡν δέη. Thuc. I, 58. (Here εἰ δέοι might have been used. See § 55, 2.) Ἐφοβεῖτο γὰρ μὴ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι σφᾶς, ὁπότε σαφῶς ἀκούσειαν, οὐκετι ἀφῶσιν. Id. I, 91. (Here ἐπόταν ἀκούσωσιν is changed to ὁπότε ἀκούσειαν, although ἀφῶσιν is retained by § 77, 2.) Μέγα τὸ δέος ἐγένετο μὴ παραπλέοντες οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι, εἰ καὶ ὡς μὴ διενοοῦντο μένειν, πορθῶσιν τὰς πόλεις, the fear was great lest the Peloponnesians as they sailed by, even if under the circumstances they had not been thinking of remaining, might destroy the cities. Id. III, 33. (Here διενοοῦντο is retained by § 74, 2.)

" $O\pi\omega_S$ and "O in Indirect Quotations.

§ 78. 1. In a few cases $\delta \pi \omega s$ is used in indirect quotations where we should expect ωs or $\delta \tau \iota$. This occurs chiefly in poetry. E. g.

Τοῦτ' αὐτὸ μή μοι φράζ', ὅπως οὖκ εἶ κακός. Soph. O. T. 548. "Αναξ, ἐρῶ μὲν οὖχ ὅπως τάχους ὅπο δύσπνους ἰκάνω. Id. Ant. 223. So Ant. 685: ὁπως σὺ μὴ λέγεις. 'Ανάπεισον ὁκως μοι ἀμείνω ἐστὶ ταῦτα οὕτω ποιεόμενα. Hdt. I. 37. So III, 115. So ὁπως πάντα επίσταμαι, Plat. Euthyd. 296 E.

2. In a few passages in Homer we find δ' (the neuter of δ s) used for $\delta\tau\iota$. E. g.

Τιγνώσκων ο oi αὐτὸς ὑπείρεχε χεῖρας ᾿Απόλλων, knowing that Apollo himself held over him his hands. II. V, 433. Εὖ νυ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ο τοι σθένος οὐκ ἐπιεικτόν. II. VIII, 32. Λεύσσετε γὰρ τό γε πάντες, ο μοι γέρας ἔρχεται ἄλλη, that my prize goes elsewhere. II. I, 120. So Od. XII, 295.

Note. 'Οθούνεκα and οΰνεκα in the tragedians, and οΰνεκα in Homer, are sometimes used like ὅτι or ὡς that; as ἄγγελλε ὁθούνεκα τέθνηκ' 'Ορέστης, Soph. El. 47; ἴσθι τοῦτο, οὕνεκα "Ελληνές ἐσμεν, Id. Phil. 232. See Soph. El. 1478, Trach. 934 (οὕνεκα with Opt.); and Il. XI, 21; Odyss. V, 216; XIII, 309.

"O T i before Direct Quotations.

§ 79. Even direct quotations are sometimes introduced by $\delta \tau \iota$, without further change in the construction. Other thus used cannot be expressed in English. E. g.

Ο δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι "Οὐδ' εἰ γενοίμην, δ Κῦρε, σοί γ' ἄν ποτε ἔτι δόξαιμι." ΧΕΝ. Απ. Ι, 6, 8. 'Απεκρίνατο ὅτι " $^{9}\Omega$ δέσποτα, οἰ ζῆ, κ.τ.λ." Id. Cyr. VII, 3, 3. Εἶπε δ' ὅτι "Εἰς καιρὸν ἤκεις," ἐψη, "ὅπως τῆς δίκης ἀκούσης." Ib. III, 1, 8. * Η ἐροῦμεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, ὅτι "'Ηδίκει γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἡ πόλις, καὶ οὐκ ὀρθῶς τὴν δίκην ἔκρινε," — ταῦτα ἡ τί ἐροῦμεν; PLAT. Crit. 50 B. So Phaed. 60 A. See also Hpt II, 115.

SECTION V.

CAUSAL SENTENCES.

§ 80. Causal sentences express the cause or reason of something stated in the leading sentence. They may be introduced by ὅτι, διότι or διόπερ, οὕνεκα or ὁθούνεκα, and ὡς, because; or by ἐπεί, ἐπειδή, ὅτε, ὁπότε, εὖτε, and sometimes ὅπου, since, seeing that.

Remark. "Ote and $\dot{\omega}_{S}$ in this causal sense must not be confounded with $\ddot{\sigma}\tau_{\ell}$ and $\dot{\omega}_{S}$, that, in indirect quotations; and $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\dot{t}$, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\dot{\eta}$, $\ddot{\sigma}\tau\epsilon$, and $\dot{\sigma}\dot{\sigma}\dot{\tau}\epsilon$ must not be confounded with the same particles in temporal sentences.

§ 81. 1. Causal sentences regularly take the Indicative, after both primary and secondary tenses; past causes being expressed by the past tenses of the Indicative. The negative particle is ov. E. g.

Κήδετο γὰρ Δαναῶν, ὅτι ῥα θνήσκοντας ὁρᾶτο. Π. Ι, 56. Χωόμε

νος, ὅτ᾽ ἄριστον ᾿Αχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισας. Π. Ι, 244. Δημοβόρος βασιλεύς, ἐπεὶ οὐτιδανοίσιν ἀνάσσεις. Π. Ι, 231. Μὴ δ᾽ οὕτως κλέπτε νόω, ἐπεὶ οὐ παρελεύσεαι οὐδέ με πείσεις. Π. Ι, 132. Νουσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ώρσε κακὴν, ὀλέκοντο δὲ λαοὶ, οῦνεκα τὸν Χρύσην ἢτίμησ' αρητήρα 'Ατρείδης. Il. I, 11. Καὶ τριήρης δέ τοι ή σεσαγμένη ανθρώπων διὰ τί ἄλλο φοβερόν έστι ἢ ὅτι ταχύ πλεῖ; διὰ τί δὲ ἄλλο ἄλυποι ἀλλήλοις είσιν οί έμπλέοντες ή διότι έν τάξει κάθηνται; ΧΕΝ. Oec. VIII, 8. Οἱ ἐμοὶ φίλοι οὖτως ἔχοντες μερὶ ἐμοῦ διατελοῦσιν, οὐ διὰ τὸ φιλεῖν έμε, άλλα διόπερ και αὐτοί αν ο ιονται βέλτιστοι γίγνεσθαι. Id. Mem. IV, 8, 7. (See § 42, 2, Note.) Πρὸς ταῦτα κρύπτε μηδὲν, ὡς ὁ πάνθ ὁρῶν καὶ πάντ' ἀκούων πάντ' ἀναπτύσσει χρόνος, i. e. since time develops all things. Soph. Hippon. Fr. 280. Μέγα δὲ τὸ ὁμοῦ τραφηναι, έπει και τοις θηρίοις πόθος τις έγγίγνεται των συντρόφων. ΧΕΝ. Mem. II, 3, 4. "Οτ' οὐν παραινοῦσ' οὐδεν ες πλέον ποιω, ικέτις άφιγμαι. SOPH. O. T. 918. 'Οπότε οὖν πόλις μὲν τὰς ἰδίας ξυμφορὰς οία τε φέσειν, είς δε εκαστος τὰς εκείνης ἀδύνατος (sc. έστί), πῶς οὐ χρη πάντας άμύνειν αὐτῆ; ΤΗυΟ. ΙΙ, 60. "Ότε τοίνυν τοῦθ οὐτως έχει, προσήκει προθύμως έθέλειν ακούειν των βουλομένων συμβουλεύειν. DEM. Ol. I, 9, 3. For εὐτε, since, see SOPH. Aj. 715, O. C. 84; for όπου, see HDT. I, 68.

2. When, however, it is implied that the cause is assigned by some other person than the speaker, the principle of indirect discourse (§ 77, 1) applies to causal sentences.

This has no effect upon the form after primary tenses; but after secondary tenses it allows the verb to stand in the Optative, in the tense originally used by the person who assigned the cause. E. g.

Τὸν Περικλέα ἐκάκιζον, ὅτι στρατηγὸς ὧν οὐκ ἐπεξάγοι, they abused Pericles, because being general he did not lead them out. Thuc. II, 21. (This states the reason assigned by the Athenians for reproaching Pericles: if Thucydides had wished to assign the cause merely on his own authority, he would have used ὅτι οὐκ ἐπεξῆγεν.) Τοὺς συνόντας ἐδόκει ποιεῖν ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἀνοσίων, ἐπείπερ ἡγήσαιντο μηδὲν ἄν ποτε ὧν πράττοιεν Θεοὺς διαλαθεῖν. ΧΕΝ. Μεπ. I, 4, 19. (See § 74, 2, Ν. 1.) Οἶσθα ἐπαινέσαντα αὐτὸν (Ὅμηρον) τὸν Ἁγαμέμνονα, ὡς βασιλεὺς εἵη ἀγαθός, because (as he said) he was a good king. Id. Symp. IV, 6. So ὡς εὐρήκοι, because (as he said) he had found, HDT. I, 44.

REMARK. We should suppose that in causal sentences of the second class (§ 81, 2) the mood and tense by which the cause would have been originally stated might also be retained, as in ordinary indirect discourse; so that in the first example above (Thuc. II. 21) ὅτι οὐκ ἐπεξάγει might also be used, in the same sense as ὅτι οὐκ

 $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \xi \acute{a} \gamma o \iota$. This, however, seems to have been avoided, to prevent the ambiguity which would arise from the three forms, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \xi \dot{\bar{\gamma}} \gamma \epsilon \nu$, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \xi \dot{\bar{\alpha}} \gamma \epsilon \iota$. It will be remembered that the first form, which is the regular one in causal sentences of the first class (§ 81, 1), is allowed only by exception in indirect quotations (§ 70, 2, N. 2); for in indirect discourse the tenses of the Indicative regularly denote time present, past, or future relatively to the leading verb; while in causal sentences (as in most other constructions) they regularly denote time absolutely present, past, or future. (See § 9.)

Note 1. The Optative in causal sentences appears to have been used only after $\tilde{\sigma}_{\tau_i}$, $\tilde{\omega}_s$, and $\hat{\epsilon}_{\pi\epsilon_i}$. It is not found in Homer.

NOTE 2. If a cause is to be expressed by an apodosis in which the Indicative or Optative with $\tilde{a}\nu$ is required, those forms can of course follow the causal particles. E. g.

Δέομαι οὖν σου παραμεῖναι ἡμῖν ' ὡς ἐγὼ οὐδ' ἃν ἐνὸς ἥδιον ἀκούσαι μι ἡ σοῦ, I beg you then to remain with us; as there is not one whom I should hear more gladly than you. PLAT. Prot. 335 D. Νῦν ὁ ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐθέλεις καὶ ἐμοί τις ἀσχολία ἐστὶ καὶ οὐκ ἃν οἷός τ' εἴην σοι παραμεῖναι ἀποτείνοντι μακροὺς λόγους— ἐλθεῖν γάρ ποί με δεῖ—εἶμι' ἐπεὶ καὶ ταῦτ' ὰν ἴσως οὐκ ἀηδώς σου ἤ κουον. Ib. 335 C.

NOTE 3. For relative causal sentences, see § 65, 4. For the causal use of the Participle, see § 109, 4.

SECTION VI.

EXPRESSION OF A WISH.

REMARK. The Greek has one form to express a wish referring to a future object, and another to express one referring to a present or past object which (it is implied) is not or was not attained. To the former class belong such wishes as O that he may come! —O that this may happen! — Utinam veniat; to the latter, such as O that this had happened! —O that this were true! — Utinam hoc factum esset, — Utinam hoc verum esset.

§ 82. If the wish refers to the *future*, the Optative is used after the particles of wishing $\epsilon i \theta \epsilon$ or $\epsilon i \gamma a \rho$ (nega-

tively, $\epsilon'' \theta \epsilon \mu \eta'$, $\epsilon'' \gamma \lambda \rho \mu \eta'$, or simply $\mu \eta'$), O that, O if, would that (O that not, &c.). $E'' \theta \epsilon$ and $\epsilon'' \gamma \alpha \rho$ may, however, be omitted; and thus the Optative often stands alone to express a wish.

The Present Optative refers to a continued or repeated action or state in the future; the Aorist (which is the most common) refers to a momentary or single

act in the future. E. g.

Αΐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ τοσσήνδε θεοὶ δύναμιν παραθείεν, Ο that the Gods would clothe me with so much strength! Od. III, 205. Aiθ ουτως, Ευμαιε, φίλον Διὶ πατρὶ γένοιο, mayest thou become in like manner a friend to father Zeus. Od. XIV, 440. Υμίν μέν θεοί δοίεν 'Ολύμπια δώματ' έχοντες εκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ίκέσθαι, may the Gods grant you, &c. II. I, 18. Μή μαν ασπουδί γε καὶ ακλειώς άπολοίμην. Π. ΧΧΙΙ, 304. Τὸ μὲν νῦν ταῦτα πρήσσοις τάπερ ἐν χεροί έχεις, may you for the present continue to do what you now have in hand. Hot. VII, 5. Θήσω πρυτανεί', η μηκέτι ζώην έγώ, or may I no longer live. ARIST. Nub. 1255. Νικώη δ' δ τι πάσιν υμίν μέλλει συνοίσειν, and may that opinion prevail, &c. Dem. Phil. I, 55, 6. Τεθναίην, ὅτε μοι μηκέτι ταῦτα μέλοι. ΜΙΜΝΕΚΜ. Ι, 2. Πλούσιον δὲ νομίζοιμι τὸν σοφόν. PLAT. Phaedr. 279 C. ⁹Ω παῖ, γένοιο πατρος εὐτυχέστερος. SOPH. Aj. 550. Οῦτω νική σαιμί τ' έγω και νομιζοίμην σοφός, on this condition may I gain the prize (in this case) and be (always) considered wise. Arist. Nub. 520. (See Note 4.) Είθ, ὧ λφοτε, φίλος ἡμῖν γένοιο. Χεν. Hell. IV, Εὶ γάρ γενοίμην, τέκνον, ἀντὶ σοῦ νεκρός. ΕUR. Hippol. Ευνενέγκοι μὲν ταῦτα ὡς βουλόμεθα. ΤΗΟς. VI, 20. Αὐτὸς ἀεὶ ἐπιστήσει καὶ ἄπαντα, ἃν ἐγὼ βούλωμαι.— ᾿Αλλὰ βουληθείης, may you only be willing! PLAT. Euthyd. 296 D. So είεν, be it so, - well.

Μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' 'Οδυσηι κάρη ὅμοισιν ἐπείη, μηδ' ἔτι Τηλεμάχοιο πατήρ κεκλημένος εἴην, then may the head of Ulysses no longer remain on his shoulders, and no longer may I be called the father of Telemachus. Π. Η, 259. (See Rem. 1.)

From its use in wishes the Optative Mood (ἔγκλισις εὐκτική) received its name.

REMARK 1. The Future Optative was not used in wishes in classic Greek. The Perfect was probably not used except in the signification of the Present (§ 17, N. 3), as in the last example. If such a phrase as $\epsilon i \theta \epsilon \ \nu \epsilon \nu \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} \kappa o \iota$ were used, it would mean O that it may prove (hereafter) that he has been victorious! See § 18, 1.

REMARK 2. In Homer we occasionally find the Present Optative in a wish referring to present time, where later writers would have used the Imperfect Indicative. E. g.

Εὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν οὖτω γε Διὸς παῖς αἰγιόχοιο Εἶην ῆματα πάντα, τέκοι δέ με πότνια "Ηρη, Τιοί μην δ' ὡς τίετ' 'Αθηναίη καὶ 'Απόλλων, 'Ως νὖν ἡμέρη ἥδε κακὸν Φέρει 'Αργείοισιν,

O that I were the son of Zeus, and that Hera were my mother, and that I were honored as Alhene and Apollo are honored, &c. Π. XIII, 825. (Here τέκοι is nearly equivalent to μήτηρ είη: cf. & τεκοῦσα, O mother. quoted under § 83, 1.)

°Ω γέρον, είθ', ώς θυμὸς ενὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν °Ως τοι γούναθ' εποιτο, βίη δε τοι εμπεδος είη· 'Αλλά σε γῆρας τείρει όμοιιον· ώς ὄφελεν τις

'Aνδρῶν ἄλλος ἔχειν, σὰ δὲ κουροτέροισι μετεῖναι.

The idea is, O that thy knees equalled thy heart in strength, &c. II.

IV, 313. At the end we have the more regular form, ὅφελέν τις

ἄλλος ἔχειν, would that some other man had it (γῆρας). § 83, 2, N. 1.

Εἴθ ὧς ἡ β ώ οιμι, βίη δέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἴη. Τῷ κε τάχ ἀντήσειε μάχης κορυθαίολος Έκτωρ, O that I were again so young, &c. II. VII, 157. See VII, 133.

For a similar exceptional use in Homer of the Present Optative in protasis, see § 49, 2, N. 6 (b). The optatives in the examples quoted above may perhaps be explained as referring to the future, and translated, O that I might be, &c.

Note 1. In the poets, especially Homer, the Optative without $\epsilon i \theta \epsilon$ or $\epsilon i \gamma \delta \rho$ sometimes expresses a concession or permission; and sometimes an exhortation, in a sense approaching that of the Imperative. E. g.

Αὖτις ᾿Αργείην Ἑλένην Μενέλαος ἄγοιτο, Menelaus may take back Argive Helen. II. IV, 19. Τεθναίης, ὁ Προῦτ', ἡ κάκτανε Βελλεροφόντην, either die, or kill Bellerophontes. II. VI, 164. 'Αλλά τις Δολίον καλ έσειε, let some one call Dolios. Od. IV, 735. So . Aesch. Prom. 1049 and 1051.

Note 2. The poets sometimes use the simple ϵl (without $-\theta \epsilon$ or $\gamma d\rho$) with the Optative in wishes. E. g.

'Αλλ' εἴ τις καὶ τούσδε μετοιχόμενος καλέσειεν. Π. Χ, 111. Εἴ μοι γένοιτο φθόγγος ἐν βραχίοσιν. ΕUR. Hec. 836.

Note 3. The poets, especially Homer, sometimes use $\dot{\omega}_s$ before the Optative in wishes. This $\dot{\omega}_s$ cannot be expressed in English; and it is not to be translated so (as if it were written $\dot{\omega}_s$), or confounded with $o\ddot{v}_{T\omega s}$ used as in Note 4. E. g.

'Ως ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος, ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι, Ο that any other also may perish, &c. Od. I, 47. See Od. XXI, 201. 'Ως ὁ τάδε πορὼν ὅλοιτ', εἴ μοι θέμις τάδ' αὐδὰν. Soph. El. 126.

Note 4. Ovrws, thus, on this condition, may be prefixed to the Optative in protestations, where a wish is expressed upon some condition; which condition is usually added in another clause. E. g.

Ο $\ddot{v} \tau \omega$ ς $\ddot{v} \sigma \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon$ τούτ $\omega \nu$, $\mu \dot{\eta}$ $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \dot{l} \partial_{l} \eta \dot{\epsilon}$ $\mu \epsilon$, $may \ you \ enjoy \ these \ on \ this condition, — do not neglect me. Dem. Aph. <math>\Pi, 842, 9$.

Note 5. The Optative in wishes belonging under this head never takes the particle $\tilde{a}\nu$. If a wish is expressed in the form of an ordinary apodosis, as $\pi \omega s \, \tilde{a}\nu \, \tilde{o}\lambda o l \mu \eta \nu$, how gladly I would perish (i. e. if I could), it does not belong here, but under § 52, 2.

§ 83. 1. If the wish refers to the present or the past, and it is implied that its object is not or was not attained, the secondary tenses of the Indicative are used. The particles of wishing here cannot be omitted.

The distinction between the Imperfect and Aorist Indicative is the same as in protasis (§ 49, 2); the Imperfect referring to present time or to a continued or repeated action in past time, and the Aorist to a momentary or single action in past time. E. g.

Είθε τοῦτο ἐποίει, would that he were now doing this, or would that he had been doing this; είθε τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, would that he had done this; είθε ἢν ἀληθές, would that it were true; είθε μὴ ἐγένετο, would that it had not happened.

Εἴθ εἶχες, ὧ τεκοῦσα, βελτίους φρένας, would that thou, O mother, hadst a better understanding. Eur. El. 1061. El γὰρ τοσαύτην δύναμιν εἶχον, would that I had so great power. Id. Alc. 1072. Εἴθε σοι, ὧ Περίκλεις, τότε συνεγενόμην. ΧΕΝ. Μειπ. I, 2, 46. Ἰω, μη γᾶς ἐπὶ ξένας θανεῖν ἔχρηζες, O that thou hadst not chosen to die in a foreign land. SOPH. O. C. 1713.

REMARK. The Indicative cannot be used in wishes without $\epsilon''\theta\epsilon$ or $\epsilon l \ \gamma \acute{a}\rho$, as it would occasion ambiguity; this cannot arise in the case of the Optative, which is not regularly used in independent sentences without $\check{a}\nu$, except in wishes. The last example quoted above shows that the Indicative with $\mu \acute{\eta}$ alone can be used in negative wishes. (This passage is often emended; see, however, Hermann's note on the passage, and on Eur. Iph. Aul. 575.)

2. The Aorist ὄφελον and sometimes the Imperfect ὅφελλον of ὀφείλω, debeo, may be used with the Infinitive in wishes of this class, with the same meaning as the secondary tenses of the Indicative. The Present Infinitive is used when the wish refers to the present or to continued or repeated past action, and the Aorist (rarely the Perfect) when it refers to the past.

"Ωφελου or ὤφελλου may be preceded by the particles of wishing, εἴθε, εἰ γάρ, or μή (not οὐ). Ε. g.

*ΩΦελε τοῦτο ποιείν, would that he were (now) doing this (lit. he ought to be doing it), or would that he had (habitually) done this (lit. he ought to have done this). "Ωφελε τοῦτο ποιησαι, would that he had done this.

*Ων ὄφελον τριτάτην περ έγων έν δώμασι μοίραν να ίειν, οί δ' ἄνδρες σόοι έμμεναι οι τότ' όλοντο, O that I were living with even a third part, &c., and that those men were safe who then perished. Od. IV, 97. Μή ὄφελον νικάν τοιῷδ' ἐπ' ἀέθλω, O that I had not been victorious in such a contest. Od. XI, 548. See II. XVIII, 86, aï όφελες σύ μέν αὖθι ναίειν, Πηλεύς δὲ θνητὴν ἀγαγέσθαι. Τὴν ο Φελ' εν νήεσσι κατακτάμεν "Αρτεμις "ω, O that Artemis had slain her, &c. Il. XIX, 59. 'Ολέσθαι ὤφελον τῆδ' ἡμέρα, O that I had perished on that day. Soph. O. T. 1157. Εἴθ' ὤφελ' 'Αργοῦς μὴ διαπτάσθαι σκάφος Κόλχων ές αίαν κυανέας Συμπληγάδας. Ευκ Med. 1. Εἰ γὰρ ἄφελον οἷοί τε εἶναι οἱ πολλοὶ τὰ μέγιστα κακὰ έξεργάζεσθαι, O that the multitude were able, &c. Plat. Crit. 44 D Μή ποτ άφελον λιπείν την Σκύρον, O that I never had left Scyros SOPH. Phil. 969. Αἴθ' ἄμα πάντες Έκτορος ὡ Φ έλετ' ἀντὶ θοῆς ἐπὶ νηνοί πεφάσθαι, would that ye all had been slain instead of Hector. ΙΙ. ΧΧΙΥ, 253. 'Ανδρός επειτ' ώφελλον αμείνονος είναι ακοιτις. δι ήδη νέμεσιν τε και αίσχεα πύλλ' ανθρώπων, O that I were the wife of a better man, who knew, &c. II. VI, 350. (For $\tilde{\eta}\delta\eta$, see § 64, 2.) For the origin of this construction, see § 49, 2, N. 3 (b) and (c).

Note 1. The secondary tenses of the Indicative are not used in Homer to express wishes; ἄφελον with the Infinitive being generally used when it is implied that the wish is not or was not fulfilled. (See § 82, Rem. 2.) The latter construction is used chiefly by the poets.

Note 2. Neither the secondary tenses of the Indicative nor the form with ωφελον in wishes can (like the Optative) be preceded by the simple ϵi (without $-\theta \epsilon$ or $\gamma a \rho$).

'Ωs, used as in § 82, N. 3, often precedes ἄφελον, &c. in Homer, and rarely in the Attic poets. E. g.

"Ηλυθες έκ πολέμου; ως ώφελες αὐτόθ' ὀλέσθαι. Π. ΙΙΙ, 428.

'Ως ὤφελλ' Έλένης ἀπὸ φῦλον ὀλέσθαι. Od. XIV, 68.

8*

'Ως πρὶν διδάξαι γ' ώφελες μέσος διαρραγηναι. ARIST. Ran. 955.

Expressions of a wish with the Optative or Indicative after είθε, εί γάρ, &c. were originally protases with the apodosis suppressed. Thus, εὶ γὰρ γένοιτο, O that it may happen (lit. if it would only happen), implies an apodosis like every's de

L

elην, I should be fortunate, or I should rejoice; εὶ γὰρ ἐγένετο, O that it had happened, implies one like εὐτυχὴς ἄν ἦν (if it had only happened, I should have been fortunate). It will be seen that the use of the moods and tenses is precisely the same as in the corresponding classes of protasis (§ 50, 2; § 49, 2). The analogy with the Latin is the same as in protasis: — εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο ποιοίη (οr ποιήσειεν), O si hoc faciat, O that he may do this; εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐποίει, O si hoc faceret, O that he were doing this; εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, O si hoc fecisset, O that he had done this; εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐγένετο, utinam ne factum esset, O that it had not happened.

The form with &φελον and the Infinitive, on the other hand, is an apodosis with a protasis implied. See § 49, 2, N. 3, b.

SECTION VII.

IMPERATIVE AND SUBJUNCTIVE IN COMMANDS, EXHORTA TIONS, AND PROHIBITIONS.

. § 84. The Imperative is used to express a command, an exhortation, or an entreaty. E. g.

Λέγε, speak thou. Φεῦγε, begone! Ἐλθέτω, let him come. Χαιρόντων, let them rejoice. Ἔρχεσθον κλισίην Πηληιάδεω ᾿Αχιλῆος. Π. Ι, 322. Ζεῦ, Ζεῦ, θεωρὸς τῶνδε πραγμάτων γενοῦ. ΑΕSCH. Choeph. 246.

Note 1. The Imperative is often emphasized by $d\gamma\epsilon$ (or $d\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$), $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon$, or $i\theta\iota$, come. These words may be in the singular when the Imperative is in the plural, and in the second person when the Imperative is in the third. E. g.

Είπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ τόνδε, φίλον τέκος, ὅστις ὅδ' ἐστίν. Π. ΗΙ, 192. 'Αλλ' ἄγε μίμνετε πάντες, ἐυκνήμιδες 'Αχαιοί. Π. Η, 331. Βάσκ' ἴθι, οὖλε ὅνειρε, θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας 'Αχαιῶν. Π. Η, 8. "Αγε δὴ ἀκούσατε. ΧΕΝ. Αροl. § 14. "Αγε τε δειπνήσατε. ΧΕΝ. Ηell. V, 1, 18. Φέρ' εἰπὲ δή μοι. Soph. Απι. 534. Φέρε δή μοι τόδε εἰπέ. Plat. Crat. 385 Β. "Ιθι δὴ λέξον ἡμῦν πρῶτον τοῦτο. ΧΕΝ. Μειη. ΗΙ, 3, 3. "Ιθι νυν παρίστασθον. Απιςτ. Ran. 1378. "Ιθι νυν λιβανωτὸν δεῦρά τις καὶ πῦρ δάτω. Ιb. 871.

REMARK. Φέρε is not used in this way in Homer.

NOTE 2. The poets sometimes use the second person of the Imperative with $\pi \hat{a} s$ in hasty commands. E. g.

"Ακουε π \hat{a} s, hear, every one! Arist. Thesm. 372. Χώρει δεῦρο π \hat{a} s ὑπηρέτης τόξευε, παῖε το φενδόνην τίς μοι δότω. Id. Av. 1187. "Αγε δὴ σιώπα π \hat{a} s ἀνήρ. Id. Ran. 1125.

Note 3. The Imperative is sometimes used in relative clauses depending on an interrogative (usually olo da), where we should expect the relative clause to be completed by δεί with an Infinitive, and the Imperative to stand by itself. E. g.

'Aλλ' οἶσθ' δ δρᾶσον; τῷ σκέλει θένε τὴν πέτραν, but do you know what to do? strike the rock with your leg! ARIST. Av. 54. (We should expect here οἶσθ' ἃ δεῖ δρᾶσαι; δρᾶσον·κ.τ.λ., do you know what to do? if so, do it: viz. strike the rock, &c.) Οἶσθ' ὅ μοι σύμπραξον, do you know what you must do for me? if so, do it. Ευκ. Heracl. 451. Οἶσθά νυν ἄ μοι γενέσθω; δεσμὰ τοῖς ξένοισι πρόσθες, do you know what must be done for me (ἃ δεῖ μοι γενέσθω)? let it be done then (γενέσθω), viz. put chains on the strangers. Id. Iph. Taur. 1203. Οἶσθ' ὡς ποίησον; SOPH. O. T. 543. (Compare Eur. Cycl. 131, οἶσθ' οὖν δ δράσεις; dost thou know what thou art to do?)

Note 4. The Imperative sometimes denotes a mere concession, and sometimes a supposition (where something is supposed to be true for argument's sake). E. g.

Πλούτει τε γὰρ κατ' οἶκον· ἐὰν δ' ἀπῆ τούτων τὸ χαίρειν, τἄλλ' ἐγὼ καπνοῦ σκιᾶς οὐκ ᾶν πριαίμην. Soph. Ant. 1168. Προσειπάτω τινὰ φιλικῶς ὅ τε ἄρχων καὶ ὁ ἰδιώτης, suppose that both the ruler and the private man address, &c. Xen. Hier. VIII, 3.

§ 85. The first person of the Subjunctive (usually in the plural) is used in exhortations, supplying the want of a first person to the Imperative. $A\gamma\epsilon$ ($\ddot{a}\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$) or $\phi'\epsilon\rho\epsilon$, come, often precedes. E. g.

"Ιωμεν, let us go. "Ιδωμεν, let us see. Οἴκαδέ περ σὺν νηυσὶ νε ώμεθα, τόνδε δ' εῶμεν, let us sail homeward with our ships, and leave lim. II. II, 236. 'Αλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ, πλέωμεν, όρμάσθω ταχύς. Soph. Phil. 526. 'Επίσχετον, μάθωμεν. Ib. 539. 'Επίσχες, ἐμβάλωμεν εἰς ἄλλον λόγον. Eur. El. 962. Παρῶμέν τε οὖν ισπερ Κῦρος κελεύει, ἀσκῶμέν τε δι' ὧν μάλιστα δυνησόμεθα κατέχειν ἀδεῖ, παρέχωμέν τε ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, κ.τ.λ. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, I, 5. 'Αλλ' ἄγεθ', ὡς ἀν ἐγὼν εἴπω, πειθώμεθα πάντες. II. II, 139. 'Αλλ' ἄγεθ', ὡς ἀν ἐγὼν εἴπω, πειθώμεθα πάντες. II. II, 139. 'Αλλ' ἄγεθ' καὶ νῶι μεθα θούριδος ἀλκῆς. II. IV, 418. Φέρε δὴ διαπεράνωμεν λόγους. Ευκ. Androm. 338. Λεῦτε φίλοι, τὸν ξεῖνον ἐρώμεθα. Od. VIII, 133.

NOTE 1. The first person singular of the Subjunctive, when it is used in this way, almost always takes $\tilde{a}\gamma\epsilon$ ($\tilde{a}\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$) or $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon$, unless some other Imperative precedes. E. g.

'Αλλ' ἄγε δὴ τὰ χρήματ' ἀριθμήσω καὶ ἴδωμαι. Od. XIII, 155. 'Αλλ' ἄγεθ' ὑμῖν τεύχε' ἐνείκω θωρηχθήναι. Od. XXII, 139. Θάπτε με ὅττι τάχιστα, πύλας 'Αίδαο περήσω, bury me as quickly as possible; let me pass the gates of Hades. Il. XXIII, 71. Φέρ ἀκούσω, come, let me hear. Hdt. I, 11. Σίγα, πνοὰς μάθω ' φέρε πρὸς οὖς βάλω. Eur. Herc. F. 1059. 'Επίσχετ' αὐδὴν των ἔσωθεν ἐκμάθω. Id. Hippol. 567. Λέγε δὴ, ἴεω. Plat. Rep. V, 157 C.

Note 2 The second and third persons of the Subjunctive are not regularly used in affirmative exhortations, the Imperative being the regular form in these persons. (For the Aorist Subjunctive with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ in prohibitions, see § 86.)

In some cases the Optative in wishes, in the second and third

persons, has almost the force of an exhortation. (§ 82, N. 1.)

In a few exceptional cases, we find even the second person of the Subjunctive in exhortations, like the first person, but always accompanied by $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon$. E. g.

Φέρ', & τέκνον, νῦν καὶ τὸ τῆς νήσου μάθης. Soph. Phil. 300.

For the Future Indicative used elliptically in exhortations after $\delta\pi\omega s$, see § 45, Note 7.

Remark. The preceding rules apply only to affirmative exhortations: these should be carefully distinguished from prohibitions with $\mu\dot{\eta}$ (§ 86). The use of the Imperative in prohibitions is generally confined to the Present tense.

§ 86. In prohibitions, in the second and third persons, the *Present Imperative* or the *Aorist Subjunctive* is used after $\mu\dot{\eta}$ and its compounds. The former expresses a continued or repeated, the latter a single or momentary prohibition.

In the first person (where the Imperative is wanting) the Present Subjunctive is allowed. E. g.

Μὴ ποίει τοῦτο, do not do this (habitually); μὴ ποιήσης τοῦτο, do not do this (single act). Ἐξαύδα, μὴ κεῦθε νόφ, ἵνα εἴδομεν ἄμφω. Π. Ι, 363. ᾿Ατρείδη, μὴ ψεὐδε' ἐπιστάμενος σάφα εἶπεῖν. Π. ΙV, 404. ᾿Αργεῖοι, μή πώ τι μεθίετε θούριδος ἀλκῆς. Π. ΙV, 234. Εἰπε μοι ειρομένφ νημερτέα, μηδ' ἐπικεύσης. Od. ΧV, 263. Ἦδη νῦν σῷ παιδὶ ἔπος φάο, μηδ' ἐπίκευθε. Od. ΧVΙ, 168. Μηκέτι νῦν δήθ αδθι λεγώ μεθα, μηδ' ἔτι δηρὸν ἀμβαλλώ μεθα ἔργον. Π. Π, 435 Υμεῖς δὲ τῷ γῷ τῷδε μὴ βαρὺν κύτον σκήψησθε, μὴ θυμοῦσθε

μηδ' ἀκιρπίαν τι ὑξητε. AESCH. Eumen. 800. Ον μήτ' ὀκνεῖτε, μήτ' ἀφῆτ' ἔπος κακόν. SOPH. O. C. 731. Μὴ θῆσθε νόμον μηδένα, ἀλλὰ τοὺς βλάπτοντας ὑμᾶς λύσατε. DEM. Ol. III, 31, 11. (Here θέσθε would not be allowed by § 86; although λύσατε, in a mere exhortation, is regular, by § 84.) Μὴ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους δικάσητε·μὴ βοηθήσητε τῷ πεπονθότι δεινά·μὴ εὐορκεῖτε. Id. Mid. 582, 15. Μὴ πρίῃ, παῖ, δὰδα. ARIST. Nub. 613. Καὶ μηδεὶς ὑπολάρη με βοῦλεσθαι λαθεῖν. Isoc. Phil. p. 101 A. § 93. Καὶ μηδεὶς οἰέσθω μ' ἀγνοεῖν. Id. Paneg. p. 55 C. § 73.

Note 1. (a.) With the exception of the first person (§ 86), the

Present Subjunctive is not used in prohibitions.

An elliptical use of the Subjunctive (sometimes the Present) after $\mu\dot{\eta}$ or $\ddot{o}\pi\omega_S$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$, with a verb of fearing understood, must not be confounded with this. (See § 46, N. 4.)

(b.) The second person of the Aorist Imperative is very seldom found in prohibitions; the third person is less rare. E. g.

Μηδ΄ ή βία σε μηδαμῶς νικη σάτω. Soph. Aj. 1334. Μηδέ σοι μελη σάτω. Aesch. Prom. 332. So Prom. 1004. Καὶ μηδεὶς ὑμῶν προσδοκη σάτω ἄλλως. Plat. Apol. 17 C.

Μὴ ψεῦσον, & Ζεῦ, τῆς ἐπιούσης ἐλπίδος. ARIST. Thes. 870.

NOTE 2. The first person singular even of the Aorist Subjunctive in prohibitions is rare, and is found only in the poets. E. g.

Μή σε, γέρον, κοίλησιν έγὼ παρὰ νηυσὶ κιχείω. ΙΙ. Ι, 26. 'Αλλά μ' ἔκ γε τῆσδε γῆς πόρθμευσον ὡς τάχιστα, μήδ' αὐτοῦ θάνω. Soph. Tr. 801. 'Ω ξεῖνοι, μὴ δῆτ' ἀδικηθῶ. Id. O. C. 174. (This may be explained also by § 46, N. 4.)

SECTION VIII.

Subjunctive (like Future Indicative) in Independent Sentences. — Interrogative Subjunctive. — $O\dot{\nu}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ with Subjunctive and Future Indicative.

§ S7. In the Homeric language the Subjunctive is sometimes used in independent sentences, with the force of a weak Future Indicative. E. g.

Οὐ γάρ πω τοίους ἴδον ἀνέρας, οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι, for I never yet saw, nor shall I (or can I) ever see such men. Il. I, 262. Ύμιν ἐν πάντεστ περικλυτὰ δῶρ' ἀνομήνω, I will enumerate the gifts, &c. Il. IX,

121. Δύσομαι ès 'Aίδαο, καὶ ἐν νεκύεσσι φαείνω, I will descend to Hades, and shine among the dead (said by the Sun). Od. XII, 383. (Here the Future δύσομαι and the Subjunctive φαείνω hardly differ in their force.) Καί ποτέ τις εἴπησιν, and some one will perhaps say. II. VI, 459. (In vs. 462, referring to the same thing, we have ως ποτέ τις ἐρέει.) Οὐκ ἔσθ' οὖτος ἀνὴρ, οὐδ' ἔσσεται, οὐδὲ γένηται, ὅς κεν Τηλεμάχω σῷ νἱέι χεῖρας ἐποίσει. Od. XVI, 437. Μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι ᾿Απόλλωνος ἐκάτοιο, I will remember and will not forget the far-shooting Apollo. Hymn. in Apoll. 1.

REMARK. The Aorist is the tense usually found in this construction. The first person singular is the most common, and instances of the second person are very rare.

Note. This Homeric Subjunctive, like the Future Indicative, is sometimes joined with \tilde{a}_{ν} or $\kappa \acute{\epsilon}$ to form an apodosis. This enabled the earlier language to express an apodosis with a sense between that of the Optative with \tilde{a}_{ν} and that of the simple Future Indicative, which the Attic was unable to do. (See § 38, 2.) E. g.

El δέ κε μη δώησιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι, but if he does not give her up, I will take her myself. II. I, 324. (Here ἔλωμαι κεν has a shade of meaning between ἐλοίμην κεν, I would take, and αἰρήσομαι, I will take, which neither the Attic Greek nor the English can express.) Compare ην χ' ὑμῖν σάφα εἴπω, ὅτε πρότερός γε πυθοίμην, Od. II, 43, with ην χ' ημῖν σάφα εἴπωι, ὅτε πρότερός γε πύθοιο, II, 31,— both referring to the same thing. See also II. III, 54; and VI, 448, the last example under § 59, Ŋ. 1.

§ 88. The first person of the Subjunctive is used in questions of doubt, where the speaker asks himself or another what he is to do. The negative particle is $\mu \dot{\eta}$. In Attic Greek this Subjunctive is often introduced by $\beta o \dot{\nu} \lambda \epsilon \iota$ or $\beta o \dot{\nu} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ (poetic $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota s$ or $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$). E. g.

Εἴπω τοῦτο; shall I say this? or βούλει εἴπω τοῦτο; do you wish that I should say this? Μὴ τοῦτο ποιῶμεν, shall we not do this? Τὶ εἴπω; or τἱ βούλεσθε εἴπω; what shall I say? or what do you want me to say? For the Future in such questions, see § 25, 1, N. 4.

Πῆ γὰρ ἐγὰ, φίλε τέκνον, ἴω; τεῦ δώμαθ ἵκω μαι ἀνδρῶν οἱ κραναὴν Ἰθάκην κάτα κοιρανέουσιν; Ἦ ἰθὺς σῆς μητρὸς ἴω καὶ σοῖο δόμοιο; whither shall I go? to whose house shall I come? &c. Od. XV, 509. Ἦ αὐτὸς κεῦθω; φάσθαι δέ με θυμὸς ἀνώγει. Od. XXI, 194. μα Σεῦ τὶ λέξω; ποῖ φρενῶν ἔλθω, πάτερ; SOPH. O. C. 310. "Ωμοι ἐγὰ, πᾶ βῶ; πᾶ στῶ; πᾶ κέλσω; Ευκ. Hec. 1056. Ποῖ τράπωμαι; ποῖ πορευθῶ; Ιb. 1099. Εἴπω τι τῶν εἰωθότων, οἱ δέσποστα; Ακιβτ. Ran. 1. Τίνα γὰρ μάρτυρα μείζω παράσχωμαι; DEM.

F. L. 416 7. Μηδ', ἐάν τι ἀνῶμαι, ... ἔρωμαι ὁπόσου πωλεῖ; may I not ask, &c.? Μηδ' ἀποκρίνωμαι οὖν, ἄν τίς με ἐρωτᾶ νέος, ἐὰν εἰδῶ; and may I not answer, &c. ΧΕΝ. Μεπ. Ι. 2, 36. Μισθωσώμεθα οὖν κήρυκα, ἡ αὐνὸς ἀνείπω; PLAT. Rep. IX, 580 Β. Μεθύοντα ἄνδρα πάνυ σφόδρα δέξεσθε συμπότην, ἡ ἀπίωμεν; will you receive him, or shall we go away? Id. Symp. 212 Ε. Ἦροτῶν βασιλέα μιμήσασθαι; shall we then be ashamed to imitate the king of the Persians? ΧΕΝ. Oecon. IV, 4.

Ποῦ δὴ βούλει καθιζόμενοι ἀναγνῶμεν; where wilt thou that we sit down and read? Plat. Phaedr. 228 Ε. (So 263 Ε.) Βούλει οὖν ἐπισκοπῶμεν ὅπου ἤδη τὸ δυνατόν ἐστι; ΧΕΝ. ΜεΜ. ΙΙΙ, 5, 1. Βούλει λάβωμαι δῆτα καὶ θίγω τί σου; SOPH. Phil. 761. Βούλεσθ ἐπεισπέσωμεν; Ευπ. Hec. 1042. Θέλεις μείνωμεν αὐτοῦ κἀνακούσωμεν γόων; SOPH. Εl. 81. Τί σοι θέλεις δῆτ' εἰκάθω; Id. Ο. Τ. 651. Θέλετε θηρασώμεθα Πενθέως ᾿Αγαυὴν μητέρ' ἐκ βακχευμάτων, χάριν τ' ἄνακτι θῶμεν; Ευπ. Bacch. 719. So with κελεύετε: ᾿Αλλὰ πῶς; εἴπω κελεύετε καὶ οὐκ ὀργιεῦσθε; do you command me to speak, &c. ? DΕΜ. Phil. III, 123, 1.

In Plat. Rep. II, 372 E, we find βούλεσθε and a Subjunctive with εἰ in protasis: εἰ δ' αὖ βούλεσθε καὶ φλεγμαίνουσαν πόλιν θεωρήσωμεν, οὐδὲν ἀποκωλύει, i. e. if you will have us examine, &c. (§ 49, 1.)

REMARK. In this construction there is an implied appeal to some person (sometimes to the speaker himself), so that $\beta o i \lambda \epsilon_i$ or some similar word can always be understood, even if it is not expressed. Homeric examples in which this is not the case fall naturally under § 87.

In the later Greek the classic form $\theta \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon \epsilon \tilde{\imath} \pi \omega$; was developed into $\theta \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon \epsilon \tilde{\imath} \nu a$ (or $\tilde{\imath} \pi \omega s$) $\epsilon \tilde{\imath} \pi \omega$;— from which comes the modern Greek $\theta \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu a \epsilon \tilde{\imath} \pi \omega$; or $\nu a \epsilon \tilde{\imath} \pi \omega s$; will you have me speak?

Note 1. The *third* person of the Subjunctive is sometimes used in questions, but less frequently than the first. This happens chiefly when a speaker refers to himself by 71s. Examples of the *second* person are very rare. E. g.

NOTE 2. The Subjunctive is often used in the question

τί πάθω; what will become of me? or what harm will it do me. literally, what shall I undergo? E. g.

"Ω μοι έγὼ, τί πάθω; τί νύ μοι μήκιστα γένηται; Od. V, 465. So II. XI, 404. Τί πάθω; τί δὲ δρῶ; τί δὲ μήσωμαι; Aesch. Sept. 1057. Τί πάθω τλήμων; Id. Pers. 912; Arist. Plut. 603. Τὶ πάθω τλήμων; Id. Pers. 912; Arist. Plut. 603. Τὸ μέλλον, εἰ χρὴ, πείσομαι: τί γὰρ πάθω; I shall suffer what is to come, if it must be; for what harm can it do me? Eur. Phoen. 895. (The difference between this and the ordinary meaning of πάσχω is here seen.) Ωμολόγηκα · τί γὰρ πάθω; Plat. Euthyd. 302 D. So in the plural, Hdt. IV, 118; Τί γὰρ πάθωμεν μὴ βουλομένων ὑμέων τιμωρέειν;

- § 89. The double negative $o\dot{v}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ is sometimes used with the Subjunctive and the Future Indicative in independent sentences, being equivalent to a strong single negative. The compounds of both $o\dot{v}$ and $\mu\dot{\eta}$ can be used here as well as the simple forms.
- 1. The Subjunctive (sometimes the Future Indicative) with οὐ μή may have the force of an emphatic Future with οὐ. Thus οὐ μὴ τοῦτο γένηται (sometimes οὐ μὴ τοῦτο γενήσεται) means this surely will not happen, being a little more emphatic than οὐ τοῦτο γενήσεται. Ε. g.

(Aor. Subj.) Οὐ μὴ πίθηται, he will not obey. Soph. Phil. 103. Οὔτε γὰρ γίγνεται οὔτε γέγονεν οὐ δὲ οὖν μὴ γένηται ἀλλοῖον ἦθος, for there is not, nor has there been, nor will there ever be, &c. Plat. Rep. VI, 492 Ε. (Here οὐδὲ μὴ γένηται is merely more emphatic than the ordinary οὐ γενήσεται.) Καὶ τῶνδ΄ ἀκούσας οὔ τι μὴ λη Φθ δόλω. ΑΕSCH. Sept. 38. 'Αλλ' οὔ ποτ ἐξ ἐμοῦ γε μὴ πάθης τόδε. Soph. Εl. 1029. Οὔτοι σ΄ 'Αχαιῶν, οἶδα, μή τις ὑβρίση. Id. Αϳ. 560. 'Αλλ' οὔ τι μὴ Φύγητε λαιψηρῷ ποδί. Ευπ. Εl. 1039. Τῶν ἤν κρατήσωμεν, οὐ μή τις ἡμῦν ἄλλος στρατὸς ἀντιστῆ κοτε ἀνθρώπων. Hdt. VII, 53. So I, 199. Οὐ μή σε κρύψω πρὸς ὅντινα βούλομαι ἀφικέσθαι. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VII, 3, 13. Οῖ γε 'Αρμένιοι οὐ μὴ δέξωνται τοὺς πολεμίους. Ib. III, 2, 8. *Αν μέντοι καθόμεθα οῖκοι, οὐδέποτ' οὐδὲν ἡμῖν οὐ μὴ γένηται τῶν δεόντων. Dem. Phil. I, 53, 4. So Phil. III, 130, 11.

(Pres. Stibj.) Ην γὰρ ἄπαξ δύο ἢ τριῶν ἡμερῶν όδὸν ἀπόσχωμεν, οὐκέτι μὴ δύνηται βασιλεὺς ἡμᾶς καταλαβεῖν. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙ, 2, 12. So οὐ μὴ δύνωνται, Ιd. Hier. ΧΙ, 15. Πρὸς ταῦτα κακούργει καὶ συκοφάντει, εἴ τι δύνασαι · οὐδέν σου παρίεμαι · ἀλλ' οὐ μὴ οἶός τ' Ӈς, but you will not be able. Plat. Rep. I, 341 B.

(Fut. Ind.) Οὔ σοι μὴ μεθέψομαί ποτε. Soph. El. 1052. Τοὺς γὰρ πονηροὺς οὖ μή ποτε ποιήσετε βελτίους. ΑΕΒCHIN. Cor. § 177. Οὔ τοι μήποτέ σ' ἐκ τῶν ἑδράνων, ὧ γέρον, ἄκοντά τις ἄξει. Soph. O. C. 176. So οὐκ οὖν μὴ όλοιπορήσεις, O. C. 848; and Hot. III, 62. Μὰ τὸν ᾿Απόλλω οὐ μή σ' ἐγὼ περιόψομἀπελθόντ' (i. επεριόψομαι ἀπελθόντα). ΑΚΙΒΤ. Ran. 508. Εἶπεν ὅτι ἡ Σπάρτη οὐδὲν μὴ κάκιον οἰκιεῖται αὐτοῦ ἀποθανόντος. ΧΕΝ. Hell. I, 6, 32. (See § 70, 2; and below, Note 1.)

The Aorist Subjunctive is the most common form in this con-

struction.

Note 1. Où μή with the Future Optative, representing a Future Indicative of the direct discourse, occurs in an indirect quotation after &s: Τά τ' ἄλλα πάντ' ἐθέσπισεν, καὶ τἀπὶ Τροίας πέργαμ' &s ο ὑ μή ποτε πέρσοιεν, εἰ μὴ τόνδε ἄγοιντο. Soph. Phil. 611. (The direct discourse was οὐ μή ποτε πέρσετε, ἐὰν μὴ τόνδε ἄγησθε. In the last example under § 89, 1, the Future Indicative is retained in the same construction. The Future Infinitive can be used in the same way; as, Εἶπε Τειρεσίας ο ὑ μή ποτε, σοῦ τήνδε γῆν οἰκοῦντος, εὖ πράξειν πόλιν. Eur. Phoen. 1590.

Οὐ μή with the Subjunctive occurs in a causal sentence after ώs, in Arist. Av. 461: Λέγε θαρρήσας ώς τὰς σπουδὰς οὐ μὴ πρότερου παραβῶμεν.

- Note 2. This construction is often explained by supposing an ellipsis of $\delta\epsilon\nu\nu\delta\nu$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\nu\nu$ or $\phi\delta\beta$ os $\epsilon\sigma\tau\nu$ between the $o\dot{v}$ and the $\mu\dot{\eta}$: this is based on such passages as Xen. Mem. II, 1, 25, $o\dot{v}$ $\phi\delta\beta$ os $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\sigma\epsilon$ $\dot{a}\gamma\dot{a}\gamma\omega$, there is no fear lest I may lead you, which with the $\phi\delta\beta$ os omitted would be $o\dot{v}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\sigma\epsilon$ $\dot{a}\gamma\dot{a}\gamma\omega$. This theory, however, leaves the following construction (§ 89, 2) entirely unexplained; and the supposed ellipsis fails to account for the meaning in many cases, as in the first example under § 89, 1.
- 2. The second person of the Future Indicative (sometimes the Subjunctive) with où $\mu\dot{\eta}$ may express a strong prohibition. Thus où $\mu\dot{\eta}$ hah $\dot{\eta}\sigma\varepsilon\iota$ s means you shall not prate (or do not prate), being more emphatic than $\mu\dot{\eta}$ hah $\varepsilon\iota$. E. g.

Ποΐος Ζεύς; οὖ μὴ ληρήσεις (ληρήσης)· οὐδ' ἔστι Ζεύς, i. e. stop your nonsense! Arist. Nub. 367. $^{\circ}\Omega$ παῖ, τί θροεῖς; οὖ μὴ παρ' όχλφ τάδε γηρύσει, do not (I beg you) speak out in this way before the people. Eur. Hippol. 213. $^{\circ}\Omega$ θύγατερ, οὖ μὴ μῦθον ἐπὶ πολλοὺς ἐρεῖς. Eur. Supp. 1066. Οὖ μὴ γυναικῶν δειλὸν εἰσοίσεις λόγον, do not adopt the cowardly language of women. Eur. Andr. 757. Οὖ μὴ ἐξεγερεῖς τὸν ὕπνφ κάτοχον κἀκκινήσεις κἀναστήσεις φοιτάδα δεινὴν νόσον, ἀ τέκνον, do not wake him. Soph. Trach. 978. Τί ποιεῖς; οὖ μὴ καταβήσει, don't come down. Arist. Vesp 397.

For the use of the future, see § 25, 1. N. 5. For the Subjunctive in this construction, see below, Rem. 2.

Note 1. A prohibition thus begun by $o\dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta}$ may be continued by $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ with another Future (or Subjunctive). An affirmative command may be added by another Future or an Imperative, after $d\lambda\lambda \dot{a}$ or $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$. E. g.

Οὐ μὴ καλεῖς μ', ὧνθρωφ', ἰκετεύω, μηδὲ κατερεῖς τοὕνομα, do not call to me, I implore you, nor speak my name. ARIST. Ran. 298. Οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χεῖρα μηδ' ἄψει πέπλων, do not bring your hand near me nor touch my garments. Eur. Hippol. 606. Οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χεῖρα, βακχεύσεις δ' ἰὼν, μηδ' ἐξομόρξει μωρίαν τὴν σὴν ἐμοί, do not bring your hand near me; but go and rage, and do not wipe off your folly on me. Id. Bacch. 343.

Οὐ μὴ λαλήσεις (λαλήσης), ἀλλ' ἀκολουθήσεις ἐμοί, do not prate, but follow me. ARIST. Nub. 505. Οὐ μὴ διατρίψεις, ἀλλὰ γεύσει τῆς θύρας, do not delay, but knock at the door. Id. Ran. 462. Οὐ μὴ φλυαρήσεις ἔχων, ῶ Σανθία, ἀλλ' ἀράμενος οἴσεις δὲ θυμοῦ καὶ πάλιν στρέψεις κάρα, ... δέξει δὲ δῶρα καὶ παραιτήσει πατρός, be not inimical to friends, but cease your rage, &c. Eur. Med. 1151. Οὐ μὴ σκώψης μηδὲ ποιήσης ἄπερ οἱ τρυγοδαίμονες οὖτοι, ἀλλ' εὐ φήμει, do not scoff, nor do what these wretches do; but keep silence! ARIST. Nub. 296. (Here the Imperative is used precisely like the Future with ἀλλά or δέ in the preceding examples.)

The Future in the clauses with $\partial \lambda \dot{a}$ or $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ will be explained by § 25, 1, N. 5 (a); in the clauses with $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ it may be explained by § 25, 1, N. 5 (b), or we may consider the construction a continuation of that with $\partial \dot{\nu}$, the $\mu \dot{\eta}$ being repeated without the $\partial \dot{\nu}$.

Note 2. In a few cases of with the Future is used interrogatively expressing an exhortation, followed by another Future with $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon$ or κal $\mu\dot{\eta}$ expressing a prohibition. E. g.

Οὐ σῖγ' ἀνέξει, μηδὲ δειλίαν ἀρεῖ (s), keep silence (lit. will you not keep silence?) and do not become a coward. Soph. Aj. 75. (Here perhaps we should punctuate οὐ σῖγ' ἀνέξει; μηδὲ δειλίαν ἀρεῖ. See Rem. 1. But the first clause, although strictly interrogative really an exhortation, and was so considered in the construction of the following clause, where the Future is to be explained on the principle of § 25, 1, N. 5 (b). Compare the examples under Note 1.) Οὐ θᾶσσον οἴσεις, μηδ' ἀπιστήσεις ἐμοί, i. e. extend your hand, and do not distrust me. Id. Trach. 1183. Οὐκ εἶ σύ τ' οἴκους, σύ τε Κρέων κατὰ στέγας, καὶ μὴ τὸ μηδὲν ἄλγος εἰς μέγ' οἴσετε. Id. O. T. 637.

REMARK 1. The examples under § 89, 2 and the notes are usually printed as interrogative, in accordance with the doctrine of Elimsley, stated in his note to Eurip. Med. 1120 (1151) and in the

Quarterly Review for June, 1812. He explains of un languages: as meaning will you not stop prating? lit. will you not not prate? and when a second clause in the Future with μηδέ or ἀλλά follows, he considers the interrogative force of ov to extend also to this. this explanation requires an entirely different theory to account for the construction of § 89, 1; whereas the rules given above consider the Subjunctive there a relic of the common Homeric Subjunctive (§ 87), and explain the Future in § 89, 2 by the principle stated in § 25, 1, N. 5, — οὐ μή having the same force of a strong single negative in both constructions. As to the examples in N. 1, the last one (where the Imperative instead of the Future follows $d\lambda\lambda d$) seems to be decisive against the interrogative force commonly ascribed to the Future in the others. The examples in N. 2 are the strongest support of Elmsley's theory, where the first clause is clearly interrogative, at least originally; but the force of the question as an exhortation seems to have guided the construction of the sentence, which is finished after the analogy of the examples in N. 1. The explanation given above (N. 2) is supported by Aesch. Sept. 250, οὐ σῖγα; μηδέν τωνδ' έρεις κατά πτόλιν, will you not keep silence? (οὐ σιν' ἀνέξει;) say nothing of this kind through the city.

We may explain the examples in N. 2 as interrogative, by considering the first clause a question with $o\dot{v}$ (implying an affirmative answer) equivalent to an exhortation, and the second a question with $\mu\dot{\eta}$ (implying a negative answer) equivalent to a prohibition. Où $\sigma\dot{v}\dot{v}$ die $\dot{\xi}\varepsilon$. $\mu\eta\dot{\delta}\dot{\varepsilon}$ de $\lambda\dot{t}$ doe $\dot{\tau}$; well thus mean, will you not keep silence? and you will not become a coward, will

you ?

Remark 2. In modern editions of the classics the Subjunctive is not found in the construction of § 89, 2. But in many of the examples quoted there and in the notes the first Aorist Subjunctive in -ons has been emended to the Future, against the authority of the Mss., in conformity to Dawes's rule. (See § 45, N. 8, with footnote.) Thus, in the three examples from the Clouds, the Mss. have the Subjunctive; and in the last (vs. 296) οὐ μή σκώψης could not be changed to οὐ μὴ σκώψεις, as the Future of σκώπτω is σκώψομαι. Elmsley's emendation σκώψει is therefore adopted by most editors. But this seems too violent a change to allow in the text, merely to sustain an arbitrary rule, which at best has nothing but accident to rest on. If both constructions (§ 89, 1 and 2) are explained on the same principle, there is no longer any reason for objecting to the Subjunctive with οὐ μή in prohibitions; and it seems most probable that both the Future and the Subjunctive were allowed in both constructions, but that the Subjunctive was more common in that of § 89, 1, and the Future in that of § 89, 2.

CHAPTER V.

THE INFINITIVE.

§ 90. The Infinitive mood expresses the simple idea of the verb, without limitation of number or person. It has the force of a neuter verbal noun, and as such it may take the neuter of the article in all its cases.

It has at the same time the attributes of a verb, so that (even when it takes the article) it may have a subject, object, and other adjuncts; and, further, it is qualified not by adjectives, but by adverbs.

§ 91. The Infinitive may as nominative be the subject of a finite verb, or as accusative be the subject of another Infinitive. The Infinitive is especially common as the subject of an impersonal verb, or of $\epsilon \sigma \tau i$. It may also be a predicate nominative, or it may stand in apposition with a substantive.

Such Infinitives stand regularly without the article; but if they are to be especially prominent as containing the leading idea of the sentence, the article may be used. E. g.

Συνέβη αὐτῷ ἐλ θ εῖν, it happened to him to go. Οὐκ ἔνεστι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. ᾿Αδύνατόν ἐστι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. ὙΕξῆν μένειν. Δεῖ αὐτὸν μένειν. Οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακὸν βασιλευέμεν, for it is no had thing to be a king. Od. I, 392. Εἶς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος, ἀμὑνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης. II. ΧΙΙ, 243. ᾿Αεὶ γὰρ ἡβᾳ τοῖς γέρουσιν εὖ μαθεῖν. ΑΕSCH. Αg. 584. Πολὺ γὰρ ἡᾶρον ἔχοντας φυλάττειν ἢ κτήσασθαι πάντα πέφυκεν. DEM. Ol. II, 25, 24. (Compare Ol. I, 16, 3: Δοκεῖ τὸ φυλάξαι τἀγαθὰ τοῦ κτήσασθαι χαλεπώτερον εἶναι.) Ἡδὺ πολλοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἔχειν; DEM. F. L. 409, 25. Δοκεῖ οἰκονόμου ἀγαθοῦ εἶναι εὖ οἰκεῖν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἴκον. ΧΕΝ. Oceon. Ii, 2. Φησὶ δεῖν τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, he says that it is necessary to λο this. (Here ποιῆσαι as accus. is the subject of δεῖν: for δεῖν, see § 92, 2.) Τὸ γνῶναι ἐπιστήμην που λαβεῖν ἐστίν, to learn is to acquire knowledge. Plat. Theaet. 209 E. Τὸ δίκην διδόναι πότερον πάσχειν

τί ἐστιν ἡ ποιεῖν; Plat. Gorg. 476 D. (In the last two examples the subject Infinitive has the article to emphasize it, while the predicate Infinitives stand alone.) Οὔτοι ἡδύ ἐστι τὸ ἔχειν χρήματα οὔτως ὡς ἀναρὸν τὸ ἀπο βάλλειν. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 3, 42. (Compare the two examples above from Demosthenes.) Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἀδικεῖν, τὸ πλέον τῶν ἄλλων ζητεῖν ἔχειν. Plat. Gorg. 483 C. ᾿Αλλ' οἶμαι, νῦν μὲν ἐπισκοτεῖ τούτοις τὸ κατορθοῦν. DEM. Ol. II, 23, 27. Τὸ γὰρ θάνατον δεδιέναι οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἡ δοκεῖν σοφὸν εἶναι μὴ ὄντα· δοκεῖν γὰρ εἰδέναι ἐστὶν ἃ οὐκοἴδεν. Plat. Apol. 29 A.

- § 92. The Infinitive without the article may be the object of a verb. It stands generally as an object accusative, sometimes as an object genitive, and sometimes as an accusative of kindred signification. The classes of verbs after which the Infinitive is thus used must be learned by practice; but the Infinitive without a subject follows in general the same classes of verbs in Greek as in English. The following, however, may be specially mentioned:—
- 1. In general, any verb whose action directly implies another action or state as its object, if such action or state is to be expressed by a verb and not by a noun, takes the Infinitive. Such are verbs signifying to teach, to learn, to accustom, to desire, to ask, to advise, to entreat, to exhort, to command, to persuade, to urge, to propose, to compel, to need, to cause, to intend, to begin, to attempt, to permit, to decide, to dare, to prefer, to choose, to pretend; those expressing fear, unwillingness, eagerness, caution, neglect, danger, postponement, forbidding, hindrance, escape, &c.; and all implying ability, fitness, desert, qualification, sufficiency, or their opposites. E. g.

Διδάσκουσιν αὐτὸν βάλλειν, they teach him to shoot. "Εμαθον τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, they learned to do this. Βούλεται ἐλθεῖν. Παραινοῦμέν σοι πειθεσθαι. Φοβοῦμαι μένειν. Αἰροῦνται πολεμεῖν. Ἡ πόλις κινδυνεύει διαφθαρῆναι. Δύναται ἀπελθεῖν. Ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν περιμεῖναί με. Δέομαι ὑμῶν συγγνώμην μοι ἔχειν. Εἶπε στρατηγοὺς ἐλέσθαι proposed to choose generals. ᾿Απαγορεύουσιν αὐτοῖς μὴ τοῦτο τοιῆσαι. (See below, § 95, 2.) Τί κωλύσει αὐτὸν βαδίζειν ὅποι βούλεται, what will prevent him from marching, §c. ? ᾿Αξιῶ λαμβάνειν. ᾿Αξιοῦται

θανείν. Οὐ πέφυκε δουλεύειν, he is not born to be a slave. 'Αναβάλλεται τοῦτο ποιείν, he postpones doing this.

This use of the Infinitive is too common to need illustration by

more particular examples.

REMARK 1. The Infinitive in this construction is generally equivalent to the English Infinitive after the same class of verbs; and it refers to indefinite or to future time. (See § 15, 1.) The Present and Aorist are the tenses usually found, with the distinction stated in the Remark before § 12: for the Perfect, see § 18, 3 (b); and for the occasional use of the Future Infinitive (or even the Infinitive with $\tilde{a}v$) after some of these verbs, see § 27, N. 2.

REMARK 2. Verbs of fearing and caution are included in the list given above, although they are generally followed by $\mu\eta$, lest, and the Subjunctive or Optative. (See § 46.) The Infinitive, however, sometimes occurs; and, when it is used, it belongs regularly under the rule, § 92, 1. (See § 46, N. 8, a and b.)

Verbs expressing danger take the Infinitive more frequently than wn with the Subjunctive or Optative. (See § 46, N. 8, c.)

Note 1. Some verbs which do not regularly take an Infinitive may be used in unusual significations, so as to allow an Infinitive by § 92, 1. E. g.

Συνέβησαν τοῖς Πλαταιεῦσι παραδοῦναι σφᾶς αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰ ὅπλα, they made an agreement with the Plataeans to surrender, &c. ΤΗ υ. Π, 4. Τίνι δ' ἄν τις μᾶλλον πιστεύσειε παρακαταθέσθαι χρήματα; to whom would any one sooner dare to commit money? ΧΕΝ. Μεm. IV, 4, 17. 'Οδύρονται οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι, they mourn to go home. Π. Η, 290. 'Επευφήμησαν' Αχαιοὶ αἰδεῖσθαι ἱερῆα. Π. Ι, 22.

Note 2. When a noun and a verb (especially $\epsilon \sigma \tau i$) together form an expression equivalent to any of the verbs of § 92, 1, they may take the Infinitive without the article. Some other expressions with a similar force take the same construction. E. g.

being tamed (=πεφυκότα τιθασεύεσθαι). PLAT. Politic. 264 A. Tis μηχανή μή οὐχὶ πάντα καταναλωθήναι είς τὸ τεθνάναι; (i. e. τί κωλύσει μη ούχι πάντα καταναλωθήναι;) PLAT. Phaed. 72 D. Δέ-δοικα μη πολλά και χαλεπά είς ἀνάγκην ἔλθωμεν ποιείν, lest we may come to the necessity of doing. Dem. Ol. I, 13, 25. "Ωρα ἀπιέναι, it is time to go away (like χρή ἀπιέναι, we must go away). PLAT. Apol. 42 A. Έλπίδας έχει τοῦτο ποι ησαι (= ἐλπίζει τοῦτο ποιησαι), he hopes to do this. But έλπὶς τοῦ έλεῖν, ΤΗυΟ. ΙΙ, 56. Oi δε ζωντες αιτιοι θανείν, and the living are those who caused them to die. Soph. Ant. 1173. We might also have αἴτιοι τοῦ τούτους θανείν or αἴτιοι τὸ τούτους θανείν. (See § 23, 1, N. 3.) So in phrases like πολλοῦ (or μικροῦ) δέω ποιεῖν τι, I want much (or little) of doing anything; παρά μικρον ήλθον ποιείν τι, they came within a little of doing anything; where the idea of ability, inability, or sufficiency appears: so in Thuc. VII, 70, βραχύ γὰρ ἀπέλιπον διακόσιαι γενέ-So έμποδών τούτω έστλν έλθειν (=κωλύει τούτον έλθειν), it prevents him from going; where τοῦ ἐλθεῖν may be used. (See § 94, and § 95, 1 and 2.)

The Infinitive depending on a noun is generally an adnominal

genitive with the article rou. See § 94 and § 95, 1.

Note 3. Although the Infinitive depending on the verbs included in § 92, 1 regularly stands without the article, yet $\tau \delta$ is sometimes prefixed to give the Infinitive still more the character of a noun in the accusative. The Infinitive is sometimes placed for emphasis apart from the main construction, like a synecdochical accusative. E. g.

Καὶ πῶς δὴ τὸ ἀρχικοὺς εἶναι ἀνθρώπων παιδεύεις; ΧΕΝ. Oecon. XIII, 4. (So παιδεύω τινά τι.) Τὸ δ' αὖ ξυνοικεῖν τῆδ' ὁμοῦ τίς ἄν γυνὴ δύναιτο; i. e. as to living with her, what woman could do it?

Soph. Tr. 545. Τὸ δρᾶν οὐκ ἦθέλησαν. Id. O. C. 442.

Οὐδείς μ αν πείσειεν τὸ μ η οὖκ ἐλθεῖν, no one could persuade me not to go. Arist. Ran. 68. (For μ η οὐ, see § 95, 2, N. 1, b.) So Xen. Hell. V, 2, 36. So θέλξει τὸ μ η κτεῖναι σύνευναν (like πείσει τὸ μ η κτεῖναι), Aesch. Prom. 865. Compare Soph. Phil. 1253, οὐδέ τοι σῆ χειρὶ πείθομαι τὸ δρᾶν, i. e. \hat{I} do not trust your hand for action (like οὐ πείθομαί σοι ταῦτα, I do not trust you in this.)

Note 4. Other active verbs than those included in § 92, 1 may take the Infinitive like an ordinary noun, as an object accusative. Here, however, the Infinitive takes the article τ 6. $\stackrel{.}{\text{E}}$. g.

Τὸ τελευτήσαι πάντων ή πεπρωμένη κατέκρινεν, fate awarded death to all. Isoc. Demon. p. 11 C. § 43.

NOTE 5. A few of the verbs included in § 92, 1, which govern the genitive of a noun, allow also the genitive of the Infinitive with τοῦ, as well as the simple Infinitive. (See § 95, 1.) This applies chiefly to ἀμελέω, ἐπιμελέομαι, and to the verbs of hindrance, &c included in § 95, 2. E. g.

'Αμελήσας τοῦ ὀργίζεσθαι. Xen. Mem. II, 3, 9. (But ἀμελήσας λέγειν, Plat. Phaed. 98 D.) Most verbs of desiring and neglecting take only the simple Infinitive. Έπιμελέομαι, which usually takes ὅπως with the Future Indicative (§ 45), allows also the simple Infinitive (Thuc. VI, 54), and the Infinitive with τοῦ (Xen. Mem. III, 3, 11). See § 45, N. 6, a.

REMARK. For the use of the Infinitive without ro after verbs as an accusative by synecdoche (usually found only after adjectives), see § 93, 2, Note 3.

2. Another case in which the Infinitive appears as the object of a verb occurs in indirect discourse, after verbs implying thought or the expression of thought (verba sentiendi et declarandi) or equivalent expressions. Here each tense of the Infinitive, instead of referring indefinitely to the future (as in the former construction, § 92, 1), represents the corresponding tense of the Indicative or Optative

REMARK. For this construction see § 73, 1; where also examples of the Infinitive with $a\nu$ in indirect discourse are given. For the distinction between the Infinitive in this construction and the ordinary Infinitive (92, 1), see § 73, 1, Remark. For the Infinitive, not in indirect discourse, after some verbs which usually belong to this class, see § 15, 2, Notes 2 and 3; see also § 23, 2, Notes 2 and 3.

- Note 1. Of the three common verbs signifying to say, $\phi\eta\mu l$ is regularly followed only by the Infinitive in indirect discourse, $\epsilon l\pi \sigma \nu$ only by $\delta\tau l$ or δs and the Indicative or Optative, while $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$ allows either construction. A singular exception in regard to $\epsilon l\pi \sigma \nu$ is found in Eur. Phoen. 1590, quoted § 89, 1, N. 1. (See § 15, 2, N. 3.)
- Note 2. After many verbs of this class in the passive both a personal and an impersonal construction are allowed: thus, we can say λέγεται ὁ Κῦρος γενέσθαι, Cyrus is said to have been, or λέγεται τον Κῦρον γενέσθαι, it is said that Cyrus was. Δοκέω in the meaning I seem (videor) usually has the personal construction, as in English; as οδτος δοκεῖ εἶναι, he seems to be. When an Infinitive with αν follows (§ 73, 1), it must be translated by an impersonal construction, to suit the English idiom: thus, δοκεῖ τις ᾶν ἔχειν must be translated it seems that some one would have, although τις is the subject of δοκεῖ; τον we cannot use would with our Infinitive, to translate ἔχειν ἀκείς (See § 42, 2, Note.)

Note 3. (a.) When an indirect quotation has been introduced by an Infinitive, a dependent relative or temporal clause in the quotation sometimes takes the Infinitive by assimilation, where we should expect an Indicative or Optative. The temporal particles ως, ὅτε, ἐπειδή, as well as the relative pronouns, are used in this construction. Herodotus also uses εἰ, if, and even διότι, because, in the same way. E. g.

Μετὰ δὲ, ὡς οὐ παύ εσθαι, ἄκεα δίζησθαι (λέγουσι), and afterwards, when it did not cease, they say that they sought for remedies. Hdt. I, 94. (Here we should expect ὡς οὐκ ἐπαύετο.) ʿΩς δ' ἀκοῦσαι τοὺς παρόντας, θόρυβον γενέσθαι (φασίν), they say that, when those present heard it, there was a tumult. Dem. F. L. 402, 8. 'Επειδὴ δὲ γεν έσθαι ἐπὶ τῆ οἰκία τῆ ᾿Αγάθωνος, (ἔφη) ἀνεψημένην καταλαμβάνειν τὴν θύραν. Plat. Symp. 174 D. See Rep. Å, 614 B. Λέγεται ᾿Αλκμαίωνι, ὅτε δὴ ἀλᾶσθαι αὐτὸν, τὸν ᾿Απόλλω ταύτην τὴν γῆν χρῆσαι οἰκεῖν. Thuc. II, 102. (See § 15, 1, N. 2.) Καὶ ὅσα αὖ μετ' ἐκείνων βουλ εὐεσθαι, οὐδενὸς ὕστερον γνώμη φανῆναι (ἔφασαν). Id. I, 91. (Here ἐβουλεύοντο would be the common form.) 'Ηγουμένης δὴ ἀληθείας οὐκ ἄν ποτε φαῖμεν αὐτῆ χορὸν κακῶν ἀκολουθῆσαι, ἀλλ ὑγιές τε καὶ δίκαιον ἦθος, ῷ καὶ σωφροσύνην ἔπεσθαι. Plat. Rep. VI, 490 C.

Εἰ γὰρ δὴ δεῖν πάντως περιθεῖναι ἄλλω τέω τὴν βασιληίην, (ἔφη) δικαιότερον εἶναι Μήδων τέω περιβαλεῖν τοῦτο. Hdt. I, 129. (Here εἰ δέοι οι εἰ δεῖ would be the ordinary expression.) So Hdt. III, 105 and 108; doubtful, II, 64 and 172. See Krüger's note on I, 129. Τιμάν δὲ Σαμίονς ἔφη, διότι ταφῆναί οἱ τὸν πάππον δημοσίη ὑπὸ Σαμίων. Hdt. III, 55.

(b.) In some cases, particularly when the provisions of a *law* are quoted, a relative is used with the Infinitive, even when no Infinitive precedes. E. g.

"Εθηκεν ἐφ' οἶs ἐξεῖναι ἀποκτιννύναι, he enacted on what conditions it is allowed to kill. Dem. Lept. 505, 19. Καὶ διὰ ταῦτα, ἄν τις ἀποκτείνη τινὰ, τὴν βουλὴν δικάζειν ἔγραψε, καὶ οὐχ ἄπερ, ᾶν ἀλῷ, εἶναι, and he did not enact what should be done if he should be convicted. Dem. Aristocr. 629, 2. (Here εἶναι is the reading of the Cod. Σ , amply defended by the preceding example, in which all editors allow ἐξεῖναι.) Δέκα γὰρ ἄνδρας προείλοντο αὐτῷ ξυμβούλους, ἄνεν ὧν μὴ κύριον εἶναι ἀπάγειν στρατιὰν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως. Τίπο. V, 63.

- § 93. The Infinitive without the article may limit the meaning of certain adjectives and adverbs.
- 1. Such are particularly adjectives denoting ability, fitness, desert, qualification, sufficiency, readiness, and

their opposites; and, in general, those denoting the same relations as the verbs which govern the Infinitive (§ 92, 1). E. g.

Δυνατὸς ποιεῖν, able to do. Δεινὸς λέγειν, skilled in speaking. Αξιός ἐστι ταῦτα λαβεῖν, he deserves to receive this. 'Ανάξιος θαυμάζεσθαι, unworthy to be admired. ''Αξιος τιμᾶσθαι, worthy to be honored. Οὐχ οἶός τε ἦν τοῦτο ἰδεῖν, he was not able to see this. Πρόθυμος Λέγειν, eager to speak. Έτοῖμος κίνδυνον ὑπομένειν, ready to endure

danger.

Θεμιστοκλέα, ίκανώτατον είπειν και γνώναι και πράξαι. Lys. Or, Fun. p. 194, § 42. Τον δ' επιτήδειον ταῦτα παθείν έφη, the people said that he was a suitable person to suffer this. DEM. Phil. III, 126, 19. Αί γὰρ εὐπραξίαι δειναὶ συγκρύψαι τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀνείδη. Id. Ol. II, 23, 29. Κυρίαν εποίησαν επιμελείσθαι της ευταξίας, they gave it (the Areopagus) power to superintend good order. Isoc. Areop. p. 147 D. § 39. Βίην δὲ ἀδύνατοι ήσαν προσφέρειν. HDT. III, 138. Mahakol Kaptepelv, too effeminate to endure. PLAT. Rep. VIII, 556 B. Ταπεινή ύμων ή διάνοια έγκαρτερείν α έγνωτε, your minds are too dejected to persevere, &c. THUC. II, 61. (In the last two examples μαλακοί and ταπεινή govern the Infinitive by the idea of inability implied in them.) Χρήματα πορίζειν εὐπορώτατον γυνή. Arist. Eccles. 236. Σοφώτεροι δή συμφοράς τὰς τῶν πέλας πάντες διαιρείν ή τύχας τὰς οἴκοθεν. ΕUR. Alemen. Fr. 103. Ἐπιστήμων λέγειν τε και σιγάν. PLAT. Phaedr. 276 A. Τάλλα ευρήσεις ύπουργειν όντας ήμας οὐ κακούς. ARIST. Pac. 430.

For examples of nouns followed by the Infinitive, see § 92, 1, N. 2.

NOTE 1. The use of the Infinitive after of s in the sense of appropriate, likely, capable, and $\delta \sigma o s$ in that of sufficient, with or without their antecedents, is to be referred to this head. (O l δs $\tau \epsilon$, able, like $\delta u \nu a \tau \delta s$, regularly takes the Infinitive.) E. g.

Οὐ γὰρ ἦν ὅρα οἴα τὸ πεδίον ἄρδειν, for it was not the proper season for irrigating the land. Xen. An. II, 3, 13. Τοιαύτας οἴας χειμῶνός τε στέγειν καὶ θέρους ἰκανὰς εἶναι. Plat. Rep. III, 415 Ε. Τοιοῦτος οἴος πείθεσθαι. Id. Crit. 46 Β. Νεμόμενοι τὰ αὐτῶν ἔκαστοι ὅσον ἀποζῆν, cultivating their own land to an extent sufficient to ive upon it. Thuc. I, 2. Ἐλείπετο τῆς νυκτὸς ὅσον σκοταίους διελθεῖν τὸ πεδίον, there was left enough of the night for crossing the plain in the dark. Xen. An. IV, 1, 5. Ἔφθασε τοσοῦτον ὅσον Πάχητε ἀνεγνωκέναι τὸ ψήφισμα, it came so much in advance (of the other ship), that Paches had already read the decree. Thuc. II, 49. (See § 18, 3, b.) Examples like the last strongly resemble those under § 98, 1 in which δστε has τοσοῦτος for its antecedent.

Other pronominal adjectives (as τοῖος, τοιόσδε, τηιοῦτος, τηλίκος, ποῖος) sometimes take an Infinitive in the same way.

Note 2. (a.) Certain impersonal verbs (like $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$, $\pi\rho\epsilon\tilde{\pi}\epsilon\iota$, $\pi\rho\sigma\tilde{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\iota$), which regularly take an Infinitive as their subject

(§ 91), are sometimes used in the Participle in a personal sense, in which case they may be followed by the Infinitive, the Participle having the force of one of the adjectives of § 93, 1. Thus τὰ ἐνόντα εἰπεῖν is equivalent to ἀ ἔνεστι εἰπεῖν, what ử is permitted to say; τὰ τροσήκοντα ῥηθῆναι is equivalent to ἀ προσήκει ἡηθῆναι, what is proper to be said, as if προσήκει were a personal verb, and as if we could say ταῦτα προσήκει, these things are becoming. E. g.

Κατιδών τὸ πλήθος τῶν ἐνόντων εἰπεῖν. Isoc. Phil. p. 104 D. § 110. Τὸν θεὸν καλεῖ οὐδὲν προσήκοντ ἐν γόοις παραστατεῖν, she is calling on the God who ought not to be present at lamentations. Aesch. Agam. 1079. (Προσήκοντα is used like adjectives meaning fit, proper, as if we could say δς οὐ προσήκει παραστατεῖν.) Φράζ, ἐπεὶ πρέπων ἔψυς πρὸ τῶνδε φωνεῖν. Soph. O. T. 9. So τὰ ἡμῖν παραγγελθέντα διεξελθεῖν (= ἀ παρηγγέλθη ἡμῖν διεξελθεῖν). Plat. Tim. 90 E.

(b.) In the same way certain adjectives, like $\delta i \kappa a \iota o s$, $\epsilon \pi \iota \kappa a i - \rho \iota o s$, $\epsilon \pi \iota \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \delta \epsilon \iota o s$, $\epsilon \dot{\pi} \dot{\iota} \delta o \dot{\xi} o s$, may be used personally with the Infinitive; as $\delta i \kappa a \iota o s$ $\epsilon \dot{\sigma} \tau \iota \tau o \hat{\upsilon} \tau o \sigma \iota o \epsilon \hat{\iota} v$, it is right for him to do this (equivalent to $\delta i \kappa a \iota o s$ $\epsilon \dot{\sigma} \tau \iota v$ $a \dot{\upsilon} \tau \dot{o} v$ $\tau o \hat{\upsilon} \tau o \sigma \sigma \iota \epsilon \hat{\iota} v$). E. g.

Φημὶ καὶ πολλῷ μειζόνων ἔτι τούτων δωρεῶν δίκαιος εἶναι τυγχάνειν, i. e. that it is right for me to receive, &c. Dem. Cor. 243, 6. Εδόκουν ἐπιτή δειοι εἶναι ὑπεξαιρεθηναι, they seemed to be convenient persons to be disposed of. Thuc. VIII, 70. Θεραπεύεσθαι ἐπικαίριοι, important persons to be taken care of. Xen. Cyr. VIII, 2, 25. Τάδε τοι ἐξ αὐτέων ἐπίδοξα γενέσθαι, it is to be expected that this will result from it. Hot. I, 89. (Πολλοὶ ἐπίδοξοι τωὐτὸ τοῦτο πείσεσθαι, it is to be expected that many will suffer this same thing, Id. VI, 12, is an example of the Future Infinitive, § 27, N. 2. So in English, many are tikety to suffer.)

These examples resemble those under § 93, 2.

Note 3. Rarely the Infinitive with $\tau \dot{\sigma}$ is used after adjectives of this class. (Compare § 92, 1, N. 3.) E. g.

Τὸ προσταλαιπωρείν οὐδεὶς πρόθυμος ήν. ΤΗυς. ΙΙ, 53.

2. Any adjective may take the Infinitive without the article as an accusative by synecdoche, showing in what respect the adjective is applicable to its noun; as $\theta \epsilon a\mu a$ aloxpov $\delta \rho \hat{a} \nu$, a sight disgraceful to look upon.

The Infinitive is here regularly active or middle, seldom passive, even when the latter would seem more natural; as χαλεπὸν ποιεῖν, hard to do, seldom χαλεπὸν ποιεῖσθαι, hard to be done. E. g.

Αλσχρον γάρ τόδε γ' έστι και έσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι, i. e. disgrace.

ful for them to hear. Il. II, 119. So Il. I, 107 and 589. Tous yas ύπερ τούτων λόγους έμοι μεν αναγκαιοτάτους προειπείν ήγουμαι, υμίν δε χρησιμωτάτους ακούσαι, i. e. most necessary for me to say, and most useful for you to hear. Dem. Mid. 522, 18. Φοβερός προσπολεμησαι, a terrible man to fight against. Id. Ol. II, 24, 12. Olkía ήδίστη ενδιαιτασθαι, a house most pleasant to live in. XEN. Mem. III, 8, 8. Τὰ γαλεπώτατα ευρείν, the things hardest to find: τὰ ράστα έντυγχάνειν, the things easiest to obtain. Ib. I, 6, 9. Πολιτεία χαλεπή συζήν, a form of government hard to live under: ἄνομος δὲ (μοναρχία) χαλεπή καὶ βαρυτάτη ξυνοική σαι. PLAT. Politic. 302 B and E. Λόγος δυνατός κατανοήσαι, a speech which it is possible to understand. Id. Phaed. 90 D. 'Ο χρόνος βραχύς άξίως διηγήσασθαι, the time is too short for narrating it properly. Id. Menex. 239 Β. Ἡ όδὸς ἐπιτηδεία πορευομένοις καὶ λέγειν καὶ ἀκούειν, convenient both for speaking and for hearing. Id. Symp. 173 B. Πότερον δε λούσασθαι ψυχρότερον (τὸ ὕδωρ); is the water there colder for bathing? XEN. Mem. III, 13, 3.

(Passive.) Κύνες αἰσχραὶ ὁρᾶσθαι (instead of ὁρᾶν). ΧΕΝ. Cyneg. III, 3. "Εστιδ' ὁ λόγος φιλαπεχθήμων μὲν, ἡηθῆναιδ' οὐκ

ασύμφορος. Isoc. Antid. p. 70, § 115.

NOTE 1. The Infinitive may be used after adverbs which correspond to the adjectives just mentioned (§ 93, 2). E. g.

Πῶς αν τοῖς μὲν εὕνοις κάλλιστα ἰδεῖν ποιοίτο τὴν ἐξέλασιν, τοῖς δὲ δυσμενέσι φοβερώτατα, in a manner most delightful for the friendly to behold, and most terrible for the ill-disposed. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 3, 5.

NOTE 2. Certain nouns, which are equivalent in meaning to the neuter of any of the adjectives which take the Infinitive, may themselves have the same construction. E. g.

Θαῦμα ὶδέσθαι, a wonderful thing to behold (like θαυμαστὸν ἰδέσθαι).

NOTE 3. (a.) In Homer verbs expressing excellence or fitness sometimes take the Infinitive (as an accusative by synecdoche), like the adjectives of § 93, 2. E. g.

"Εκτορος ήδε γυνή, δς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι, this is the wife of Hector, who was the first in fighting. Il. VI, 460. 'Ομηλικίην ἐκέκαστο ὅρνιθας γνῶναι καὶ ἀναίσιμα μνθήσασθαι. Od. II, 158. Οἱ περὶ μὲν βουλήν Δαναῶν, περὶ δ' ἐστὲ μάχεσθαι, ye who excel the Danai in counsel and excel them in battle. II. I, 258. (Here βουλήν and μάχεσθαι are alike in the accusative by synecdoche after π ερὶ... ἐστέ.)

(b.) Even in Attic Greek the Infinitive is sometimes used after verbs as a synecdochical accusative. The Infinitives ἀκούειν, ἀκούσαι, in sound, and ὁρᾶν, ἰδεῖν, in appearance, especially, are used in this way. E. g.

Δοκείς οὖν τι διαφέρε: αὐτοὺς ἰδείν χάλκεως; do you think that

they differ at all in appearance from a brazier? Plat. Rep. VI, 495 E. Compare εὐρύτερος ἰδέα θαι, II. III, 194. ᾿Ακοῦσαι παγκάλως ἔχει, it ω very fine in its sound. Dem. F. L. 355, 29. Πράγματα παρέξουσιν (οἱ ἵπποι) ἐπιμέλεσθαι, the horses will make trouble about tending. Xen. Cyr. IV, 5, 46.

Note 4. The Homeric use of $\delta\mu a \hat{i} o s$, equal, like, with the Infinitive is to be referred to the same principle. E. g.

Λευκότεροι χιόνος, θ είειν δ' ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοῖοι, (horses) whiter than snow, and like the winds in swiftness. II. X, 437. Οὐ γάρ οἶ τις ὁμοῖος ἐπισπέσθαι ποσὶν ἦεν. II. XIV, 521.

§ 94. The Infinitive as genitive, dative, or accusative is very often governed by prepositions, or by adverbs used as prepositions. In this case it always takes the article $\tau o \hat{v}$, $\tau \hat{\varphi}$, or $\tau \delta$. E. g.

Τοὺς γὰρ λόγους περὶ τοῦ τιμωρήσασθαι Φίλιππον ὁρῶ γιγνομένους, for I see that the speeches are made about punishing Philip. DEM. Ol. III, 28, 5. Πρὸ τοῦ τοὺς ὅρκους ἀποδοῦναι, before taking the oaths. Id. Cor. 234, 6. Ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς χάριν δημηγορεῖν ένίους. Id. Ol. III, 29, 18. Πρὸς τῷ μηδὲν ἐκ τῆς πρεσβείας λαβεῖν, besides receiving nothing for the embassy. Id. F. L. 412, 21. Ἐν τῷ πολίτην ποιεῖσθαι (Χαρίδημον), in making Charidemus a citizen. Id. Aristocr. 683, 22. Ἔνεκα τοῦ πλείω ποιῆσαι τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν οὐσίαν. Isoc. Demon. p. 6 Å. § 19. Ἐθανμάζετο ἐπὶ τῷ εὐθύμως ζῆν. ΧΕΝ. Μεm. IV, 8, 2. Τομως διὰ τὸ ξένος εἶναι οὐκ ὰν οἴει ἀδικηθῆναι, on account of being a stranger. Ib. II, 1, 15. Πάντων διαφέρων ἐφαίνετο, καὶ εἶς τὸ ταχὸ μανθάνειν ἀ δέοι καὶ εἶς τὸ καλῶς ἕκαστα ποιεῖν. Id. Cyr. I, 3, 1.

§ 95. 1. The genitive and dative of the Infinitive, with the article, may stand in most of the constructions belonging to those cases; as in that of the adnominal genitive, the genitive after comparatives, the genitive after verbs and adjectives, the dative of manner, means, &c., the dative after such verbs as $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\omega$ and after adjectives denoting resemblance, &c., and sometimes in that of the genitive of cause or motive. E. g.

Τοῦ πιεῖν ἐπιθυμία, the desire to drink. ΤΗ UC. VI, 84. Πόνους δὲ τοῦ ζῆν ἡδέως ἡγεμόνας νομίζετε. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 5, 12. Εἰς ἐλπίδα ἢλθον τοῦ ἐλεῖν (τὴν πόλιν), i, e. hope of taking the city. ΤΗ UC. II, 56. (See § 92, 1, N. 2.) Νέοις τὸ σιγῶν κρεῖττόν ἐστι τοῦ λαλεῖν ΜΕΝΑΝΟ. Μοπος. 387. Παρεκάλει ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοῦ ὡς φρονιμώτατον εἶναι. ΧΕΝ. Μεπ. I, 2, 55. So III, 3, 11 See

§ 92, 1, N. 5. (Ἐπιμελέομαι usually takes ὅπως with the Future Indicative, by § 45.) Ἐπέσχομεν τοῦ δακρύειν, we ceased to weep. Plat. Phaed. 117 E. (See below, § 95, 2.) Καὶ γὰρ ἀήθεις τοῦ κατακούειν τινός εἰσιν, for they are unused to obeying any one. Dem. Ol. I, 15, 28.

Οὐδενὶ τῶν πάντων πλέον κεκράτηκε Φίλιππος ἢ τῷ πρότερος πρὸς τοῖς πράγμασι γίγνεσθαι. Id. Chers. 92, 21. 'Αλλὰ τῷ φανερὸς εἶναι τοιοῦτος ἄν, by making it plain that he was such a man. ΧΕΝ Μεm. I, 2, 3. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τῷ γε κοσμίως ζῆν ἄξιον πιστεύειν, to trust in an orderly life. Isoc. Antid. p. 315 Α. § 24. "Ισον δὲ τῷ προστένειν. ΑΕΒCΗ. Αgam. 253. Τῷ ζῆν ἔστι τι ἐναντίον, ὥσπερ τῷ ἐγρηγορέναι τὸ καθεύδειν. PLAT. Phaed. 71 C.

Μίνως τὸ ληστικὸν καθήρει, τοῦ τὰς προσόδους μᾶλλον ἰέναι αὐτῷ,

in order that greater revenues might come in. Thuc. I, 4.

Note. It will be seen that the nominative and accusative of the Infinitive (except the accusative after prepositions) regularly stand without the article; the genitive and dative regularly with the article. The Infinitive after the verbs included in § 92, 1, however, generally stands without the article, whatever case it represents; and further, whenever any word which might govern a genitive or dative of the Infinitive forms a part of an expression which is equivalent to any of the verbs of § 92, 1, the simple Infinitive may be used. (See § 92, 1, Note 2.)

2. After verbs and expressions which denote hindrance or freedom from anything, two constructions are allowed,—that of the simple Infinitive (§ 92, 1), and that of the genitive of the Infinitive with $\tau o\hat{v}$ (§ 95, 1).

Thus we can say (a) εἴργει σε τοῦτο ποιεῖν, and (b) εἴργει σε τοῦ τοῦτο ποιεῖν (both with the same meaning), he prevents you from doing this. As the Infinitive after such verbs can take the negative $\mu\eta'$ without affecting the sense, we have a third and a fourth form, still with the same meaning:—
(c) εἴργει σε $\mu\dot{\eta}$ τοῦτο ποιεῖν, and (d) εἴργει σε τοῦ $\mu\dot{\eta}$ τοῦτο ποιεῖν, he prevents you from doing this. For a fifth form with the same meaning, see § 95, 3. (For the negative $\mu\dot{\eta}$, see Note 1, a.)

If the leading verb is itself negative (or interrogative with a negative implied), the double negative $\mu\dot{\eta}$ où is generally used instead of $\mu\dot{\eta}$ in the form (c) with the simple Infinitive, but seldom (or never) in the form (d) with the genitive of the Infinitive; as où κ είργει $s \in \mu\dot{\eta}$ αὐ τοῦτο ποιείν, he does not pre-

ven' you from doing this; selaom (or never) τοῦ μὴ οὐ τοῦτο ποισῦν. See also § 95, 3. (For the double negative, see Now 1, b.) E. g.

- (a.) Ἐπὶ Ὁλύνθου ἀποπέμπουσιν, ὅπως εἴργωσι τοὺς ἐκεῖθεν ἐπι-βοηθεῖν. ΤΗυς. Ι, 62. Εἰ τοῦτό τις εἴργει δρᾶν ὅκνος, if any hesitation prevents you from doing this. Plat. Soph. 242 A. "Αλλως δέ πως πορίζεσθαι τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ὅρκους ἤδη κατέχοντας ἡμᾶς (ἦδειν). ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΠΙ, 1, 20. Κακὸν δὲ ποῖον εἰργε τοῦτ' ἐξειδέναι; Soph. O. Τ. 129. Εὐδοκιμεῖν ἐμποδῶν σφίσιν εἰναι. Plat. Euthyd. 305 D. Παιδὸς Φέρητος, ὃν θανεῖν ἐρρυσάμην. Ευκ. Alc. 11. Τον Φίλιππον παρελθεῖν οὐκ ἐδυναντο κωλῶσαι. DEM. Pac. 62, 10. Τὴν ἰδέαν τῆς γῆς οὐδέν με κωλύει λέγειν. Plat. Phaed. 108 Ε.
- (b.) Τοῦ δὲ δραπετεύειν δεσμοῖς ἀπείργουσι; ΧΕΝ. Μεm. II, 1, 16. Τὸ γὰρ ψευδόμενον φαίνεσθαι καὶ τοῦ συγγνώμης τινὸς τυγχάνειν ἐμποδὰν μάλιστα ἀνθρώποις γίγνεται. Id. Cyr. III, 1, 9. Εἶπεν ὅτι κωλύσειε (ἀν) τοῦ καίειν ἐπιόντας. Id. An. I, 6, 2. ᾿Απεσχόμην τοῦ λαβεῖν τοῦ δικαίου ἔνεκα. DEM. F. L. 410, 18.
- (c.) Εἶργε μὴ βλαστάνειν. Plat. Phaedr. 251 B. "Οπερ εσχε μὴ τὴν Πελοπόννησον πορθεῖν, which prevented him from ravaging the Peloponnesus. Thuc. I, 73. Διεκώλυσε μὴ διαφθεῖραι. Id. II, 49. Έπεγένετο κωλύματα μὴ αὐξηθῆναι. Id. I, 16. (§ 92, 1, N. 2.) Θυητούς γ' ἔπαυσα μὴ προσδέρκεσθαι μόρον. Aesch. Prom. 248. Τοὐμὸν φυλάξει σ' ὄνομα μὴ πάσχειν κακῶς. Soph. O. C. 667.
- Οὐ γὰρ ἔστι Ἦχλησι οὐδεμία ἔκδυσις μὴ οὐ δόντας λόγον εἶναι σοὺς δούλους. Η ΣΤ. VIII, 100. Πέμπουσι κήρυκα, ὑποδεξάμενοι σχήσειν τὸν Σπαρτιήτην μὴ ἐξιέναι...Οὐ δυνατοὶ αὐτὴν ἴσχειν εἰσὶ ᾿Αργεῖοι μὴ οὐκ ἐξιέναι. Ιd. ΙΧ, 12. "Ωστε ξένον γ' ἃν οὐδεν ὄνθ', ὥσπερ σὺ νῦν, ὑπεκτραποίμην μὴ οὐ συνεκ σώζειν. SOPH. O. C. 565. Τί ἐμποδών μὴ οὐχὶ ὑβριζομένους ἀποθανεῖν; ΧΕΝ. ΑΝ. ΠΙ, 1, 13. (Τί ἐμποδών here implies ουδὲν ἐμποδών.) Τίνος ἄν δέσιο μὴ οὐχὶ πάμπαν εὐδαίμων εἶναι; what would hinder you from being perfectly happy? Id. Hell. IV, 1, 36. So ARIST. Ran. 695.
- (d.) Πῶς γὰρ ἀσκὸς δύο ἄνδρας ἔξει τοῦ μὴ καταδῦναι, i. e. will keep two men from sinking. Xen. An. III, 5, 11. Ον οὐδείς πω προθεὶς τοῦ μὴ πλέον ἔχειν ἀπετράπετο. Thuc. I, 76. Εἰ δ' ἄρ' ἐμποδών τι αὐτῷ ἐγένετο τοῦ μὴ εὐθὺς τότε δικάσασθαι. Dem. Apatur. 900, 22. Ἡπίστατο τὴν πόλιν μικρὸν ἀπολιποῦσαν τοῦ μὴ τῶς ἐσχάταις συμφοραῖς περιπεσεῖν. Isoc. Antid. p. 73, § 122. ᾿Αποσυβοῦντες ἄν ἐμποδῶν γίγνοιντο τοῦ μὴ ὁρᾶν αὐτοὺς τὸ δλον στράτευμα. Xen. Cyr. II, 4, 23. Εἰδότες ὅτι ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ εἰσι τοῦ μη δὲν παθεῖν. Ib. III, 3, 31. (See Thuc. VI, 18, quoted § 92, 1, N. 2.) Τοῦ δὲ μὴ (κακῶς) πάσχε ν αὐτοὶ πᾶσαν ἄδειαν ῆγετε, you were entirely free from fear of suffi ring harm. Dem. F. L. 387, 17. Ἐνούσης οὐδεμιᾶς ἔτ' ἀποστροφῆς τοῦ μὴ τὰ χρήματ' ἔχειν ῦμᾶς, there being no longer any escape from the conclusion that you have taken bribes. Id. Timoc. 702, 26.

REMARK. The last two examples show that $\mu \hat{\eta}$ can be joined with the genitive of the Infinitive, even after nouns implying hindrance or freedom. In the two following the addition of $\mu \hat{\eta}$ is more peculiar:—

'Η ἀπορία τοῦ μὴ ἡσυχάζειν, the inability to rest. Thuc. II, 49. 'Η τοῦ μὴ ξυμπλεῖν ἀπιστία, the distrust of sailing with them; i. e. the unwillingness to sail, caused by distrust. Id. III, 75.

- Note 1. (a.) The use of $\mu\eta'$ with the Infinitive in the forms c and d is to be referred to the general principle, by which the Infinitive after all verbs expressing a negative idea (as those of denying, distrusting, concealing, forbidding, &c.) can always take the negative $\mu\eta'$, to strengthen the negation implied in the leading verb. Thus we say directrat $\mu\eta'$ directrate that this is true; dunyine $\mu\eta$ directrate $\mu\eta$
- (b.) An Infinitive which for any reason would regularly take μή (either affecting the Infinitive itself, as an ordinary negative, or strengthening a preceding negation, as in the case just mentioned) generally takes the double negative μὴ οὐ, if the verb on which it depends is itself negative. Thus the example given above, ἀρνεῖται μὴ ἀληθὲς εἶναι τοῦτο, becomes, if we negative the leading verb, οὐκ ἀρνεῖται μὴ οὐκ ἀληθὲς εἶναι τοῦτο, he does not deny that this is true. So, when the original μή really negatives the Infinitive, as in δίκαιόν ἐστι μὴ τοῦτον ἀφιέναι, it is just not to acquit him, if we negative the leading verb, we shall have οὐ δίκαιόν ἐστι μὴ οὖ τοῦτον ἀφιέναι, it is not just not to acquit him. See Plat. Rep. IV, 427 Ε, ὡς οὐχ ὅσιόν σοι ὁν μὴ οὐ βοηθεῖν δικαιοσύνη. This applies also to the Infinitive with τό (§ 95, 3).
- Mἡ οὐ is occasionally used before participles, and even before nouns, on the same principle, to express an exception to a statement containing a negative; as in Plat. Lys. 210 D, ο ὑ κ ἄρα ἐστὶ φίλου τῷ φιλοῦντι οὐδὲν μἡ ο ὑ κ ἀντιφιλοῦν, unless it loves in return. Here, if the negatives (οὐκ and οὐδὲν) were removed from the leading verb, we should have simply μἡ ἀντιφιλοῦν (with the same meaning), which would be the ordinary form with the participle, even after a negative. So μἡ οὐκ ἐσύντες, unless they were. HDT. VI, 9. So in DEM. F. L. 379, 7, we find aἴ τε πόλεις πολλαὶ καὶ χαλεπαὶ λαβεῖν, μἡ οὐ χρόνῷ καὶ πολιορκία, the cities were many and difficult (= not easy) to capture, except by long siege.

Note 2. When the leading verb expressing hindrance, &c. is itself negative, the form c, $\mu\eta$ of with the Infinitive, is the most common. The form a, the Infinitive alone, is allowed after negative (as well as affirmative) verbs, as in Dem. Pac. 62, 10, quoted above under a. The form b, $\tau \circ \bar{v}$ with the Infinitive (without $\mu\eta$), is not used after negative verbs, according to Madvig.

Even in the form c, we sometimes find the single negative $\mu\eta$ (for

μη οὐ), even when the leading verb is negative. E. g.

Οὖ πολὺν χρόνον μ' ἐπέσχον μή με ναυστολεῖν ταχύ. Soph. Phil. 349. Οὖδέ μ' ὄμματος φρουρὰν παρῆλθε, τόνδε μὴ λεύσσειν στόλον. Id. Trach. 226. (Μὴ οὖ here is a conjecture.)

3. The Infinitive preceded by $\tau o \mu \eta$ is sometimes used after verbs and expressions denoting hindrance, and also after all expressions which even imply prevention, omission, or denial.

This Infinitive with $r\delta$ is less closely connected than the simple Infinitive with the leading verb, and often denotes merely the result of the prevention or omission of anything: it may generally be explained as an accusative by synecdoche, or sometimes as an object accusative (as after verbs of denial). Here, as before (§ 95, 2), if the leading verb is itself negative, or interrogative with a negative implied, $\mu\dot{\eta}$ où is generally used instead of $\mu\dot{\eta}$. E. g.

Τὸν πλεῖστον ὅμιλον εἶργον τὸ μὴ προεξιόντας τῶν ὅπλων τὰ ἐγγὸς τῆς πόλεως κακουργεῖν, they prevented them from injuring, &c. ΤΗυς. ΙΙΙ, 1. (This adds a fifth expression, εἴργει σε τὸ μὴ τοῦτο ποιεῖν, to the four already given (§ 95, 2) as equivalents of the English, he prevents you from doing this.) Τὸ δὲ μὴ λεηλατῆσαι τὴν πόλιν ἔσχε τόδε. Ηρτ. V, 101. Φόβος τε ξυγγενῆς τὸ μὴ ἀδικεῖν σχήσει. ΑΕΒCΗ. Ευμ. 691. Οὖτοί εἰσιν μόνοι ἔτι ἡμῦν ἐμποδὼν τὸ μὴ ἤδη εἶναι ἔνθα πάλαι ἐσπεύδομεν. ΧΕΝ. ΑΝ. ΙV, 8, 14. Οὐκ ἀπεσχόμην τὸ μὴ οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἐλθεῖν. ΡΙΑΤ. Rep. I, 354 Β. Οὐκ ἀπέσχοντο οὐδ' ἀπὸ τῶν φίλων τὸ μὴ οὐχὶ πλεονεκτεῖν αὐτῶν πειρᾶσθαι. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 6, 32. Κίμωνα παρὰ τρεῖς ἀφείσαν ψήφους τὸ μὴ θανάτω ζημιῶσαι, i. e. they allowed Cimon by three votes to escape the punishment of death. DEM. Aristocr. 688, 27

Τρείς δὲ μόναι ψῆφοι διήνεγκαν τὸ μὴ θανάτου τιμῆσαι, and only three votes prevented you from condemning him to death (lit. made the difference as to condemning, &c.). Ib. 676, 12. Φόβος γὰρ ἀνθ' ὕπνου παραστατεῖ τὸ μὴ βεβαίως βλέφαρα συμβαλεῖν ὕπνφ, i. e. stands by to prevent my closing my eves, &c. Aesch. Agam. 15.

Έπεὶ προθυμεῖσθ', οὐκ ἐναντιώσομαι τὸ μὴ οὐ γεγωνεῖν πᾶν ὅσον προσχρήζετε. Id. Prom. 786. Οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ ταῦτ' ἐπαρκέσει τὸ μὴ ου πεσείν ατίμως πτώματ' ουκ ανασχετά, this will not suffice to prevent him from falling, &c. Ib. 918. Λείπει μεν οὐδ' å πρόσθεν ήδεμεν τὸ μη οὐ βαρύστον είναι, they lack nothing of being heavily grievous. Soph. O. T. 1232. Μήτοι, κασιγνήτη, μ' ατιμάσης τὸ μη ου θανείν τε σύν σοὶ, τὸν θανόντα θ' άγνίσαι, do not think me too mean to die with thee, &c. Id. Ant. 544. (Cf. Ant. 22, and Oed. Col. 49.) Αὐτὴν μὴν οὐ μισοῦντ' ἐκείνην τὴν πόλιν τὸ μὴ οὐ μεγάλην εἶναι Φύσει κευδαίμονα, i. e. not grudging the city its right to be great, &c. ARIST. Av. 36. (Compare μίσησέν μιν κυσὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι, Π. XVII, 272) Οὐδεὶς ἀντιλέγει τὸ μὴ οὐ λέξειν ὅ τι ἔκαστος ἡγεῖται πλείστου άξι ν επίστασθαι, no one objects to saying, &c. XEN. Conv. ΙΙΙ, 3. Οὐδ' ἄρνησις ἔστιν αὐτοίς τὸ μὴ ταῦθ' ὑπὲρ Φιλίππου πράτ-Telv, it is not even possible for them to deny that they did these things in the interest of Philip. Dem. F. L. 392, 13. Μή παρής το μή ου φράσαι, do not omit to speak of it. Soph. O. T. 283. Οὐδένα δύνασθαι κρύπτειν το μη ου χ ήδέως άν καὶ ώμων έσθίειν αὐτων, that no one is able to prevent people from knowing that he would gladly even eat some of them raw. XEN. Hell. III, 3, 6.

For $\mu \dot{\eta}$ où, see § 95, 2, Note 1, (b.).

Note. The simple negative form $\tau \delta \mu \dot{\eta}$ is sometimes found even when the leading verb is negative, where regularly $\tau \delta \mu \dot{\eta}$ où would be used. This is more common here than in the corresponding case, § 95, 2, Note 2. E. g.

Οὖκ ἂν ἐσχόμην τὸ μὴ ἀποκλῆσαι τοὺμὸν ἄθλιον δέμας. Soph. O. T. 1387. Τίς σοῦ ἀπελείφθη τὸ μή σοι ἀκολουθεῖν; ΧεΝ. Cyr. V, 1, 25. Ἦκος δ' οὐδὲν ἐπήρκεσαν τὸ μὴ πόλιν μὲν ὥσπερ οὖν ἔχει παθεῖν. ΑΕSCH. Αgam. 1170. Οὐκ ὧν ἔστι μηχανὴ οὐδεμία τὸ μὴ κεῖνον ἐπιβουλεύειν ἐμοί. Hdt. I, 209. Καὶ φημὶ δρᾶσαι, κοὐκ ἀπαρνοῦμαι τὸ μή. Soph. Ant. 443. See also Dem. F. L. 392, 13, quoted above.

REMARK. Τὸ μή and τοῦ μή can of course be used with the Infinitive as ordinary negatives. See examples, § 92, 1, N. 3. So ἐπιμελεῖται τοῦ μὴ δίκην δοῦναι.

§ 96. The Infinitive with its subject, object, or other adjuncts (sometimes including dependent verbs) may be preceded by the article τo , the whole sentence standing as a single noun, either as the subject or object of a

verb, as the object of a preposition, or in apposition with a pronoun like $\tau o \hat{v} \tau o$. E. g.

Τὸ μὲν γὰρ πολλὰ ἀπολωλε κέναι κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀμελείας ἄν τις θείη δικαίως · τὸ δὲ μήτε πάλαι τοῦτο πεπον θέναι πεφηνέναι τέ τινα ἡμῖν συμμαχίαν τούτων ἀντίρροπον, ἃν βουλώμεθα χρῆσθαι, τῆς παρ' ἐκείνων εὐνοίας εὐεργέτημ' ἃν ἔγωγε θείην. DEM. Ol. I, 12, 3.

§ 97. The Infinitive without the article often expresses a purpose. E. g.

Τρώων ἄνδρα εκαστον (εί) ελοίμεθα οίνοχοεύειν, if we should choose every man of the Trojans to be our cup-bearer. Il. II. 127. II. I, 338, δὸς ἄγειν, and ΪΙ, 107, 108. Τἦν έξ Αρείου πάγου βουλὴν ἐπέστησαι ἐπιμελείσθαι τῆς εὐκοσμίας, i. e. for the purpose of guarding good order. ISOC. Areop. p. 147 B. § 37. Ol apyoutes, ous ύμεις είλεσθε ἄρχειν μου, the rulers, whom you chose to rule me. PLAT. Apol. 28 E. Δέκα δὲ τῶν νεῶν προὔπεμψαν ἐς τὸν μέγαν λιμένα $\pi \lambda \in \hat{v} \sigma \alpha i$ τε καὶ κατασκέψασθαι, καὶ κηρ $\hat{v} \xi \alpha i$, κ.τ.λ., i. e. they sent them to sail and examine, and to proclaim, &c. Thuc. VI, 50. Tous ίππέας παρείχοντο Πελοποννησίοις ξυστρατεύειν. Id. II, 12. Συνέβησαν τοις Πλαταιεύσι παραδούναι σφάς αὐτούς καὶ τὰ ὅπλα, χρήσασθαι ο τι αν βούλωνται, i. e. to do with them whatever they pleased. Id. II, 4. (For παραδοῦναι see § 92, 1, N. 1.) Εἰ βουλοίμεθά τω ἐπιτρέψαι ἡ παίδας παιδεῦσαι, ἡ χρήματα διασῶσαι, κ. τ. λ., if we should wish to intrust to any one either children to instruct or money to keep, &c. Xen. Mem. I, 5, 2. Ai γυναίκες πιε ιν φέρουσaι, the women bringing them (something) to drink. XEN. Hell. VII, 2, 9. Τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν ἄκραν φυλάττειν αὐτοῖς παρέδωκαν, they delivered the city and the citadel to them to guard. Ib. IV, 4, 15. Os γαρ αν ύμας λάθη, τοῦτον ἀφίετε τοῖς θεοῖς κολάζειν. DEM. F. L. 363, 25,

'Η θύρα ἡ ἐμὴ ἀνέφκτο εἰσιέναι τῷ δεομένο τι ἐμοῦ. ΧΕΝ. Hell. V, 1, 14. Οὐκ εἰχον ἀργύριον ἐπισιτίζεσθαι, they had no money to buy provisions. Id. An. VII, 1, 7. 'Αριστάρχω ἔδοτε ἡμέραν ἀπολογήσαθαι, i. e. a day to defend himself in. Id. Hell. I, 7, 28. 'Εμαντόν σοι ἐμμελετᾶν παρέχειν οὐ πάνυ δέδοκται. PLAT. Phaedr. 228 Ε. Οἶς ἐνευδαιμονῆσαι τε ὁ βίος ὁμοίως καὶ ἐντελευτῆσαι ξυνεμετρήθη. THUC. II, 44.

Here, as in § 93, 2, the Infinitive is generally active or middle, even where the passive would seem more natural; as κτανείν ἐμοί νιν ἔδοσαν, they gave her to me to be killed. Eur. Troad. 874.

NOTE 1. The Infinitive is thus used in prose chiefly after verbs signifying to choose or appoint, to give or take (the Infinitive denoting the purpose for which anything is given or taken), and also after those signifying to send or bring. (See the examples.) With the last class the Future Participle is more common. A final clause after i_{pa} , &c. may also be used in the same sense.

In poetry the same construction sometimes occurs after verbs of motion, like $\epsilon l \mu \iota$, $\tilde{\eta} \kappa \omega$, and $\beta a l \nu \omega$; and also after $\epsilon l \mu l$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \mu \iota$, and $\pi a \rho \epsilon \iota \mu \iota$ (to be, to be at hand), expressed or understood. E. g

'Aλλά τις εἴη εἶπ εῖν 'Ατρείδη 'Αγαμέμνονι, ποιμένι λαῶν, but let some one go to tell Agamemnon. Od. XIV, 496. (See Passow, s.v. εἶμι.) Βη δὲ θέ εἰν, and he started to run. II. II, 182. Οὐδέ τις εστιν ἀρὴν καὶ λοιγὸν ἀμῦναι, nor is there any one to keep off curse and ruin. II. XXIV, 489. Πολλοί δ' αὖ σοὶ 'Αχαιοὶ ἐναιρέμεν δικε δύνηαι, i. e., for you to slay whomsoever you can. II. VI, 229. Οὐ γὰρ ἔπ' ἀνὴρ οἶος 'Οδυσσεὺς ἔσκεν, ἀρὴν ἀπὸ οἴκου ἀμῦναι. Od. II, 59. Μανθάνειν γὰρ ῆκομεν, for we are come to learn. Soph. OC. 12. Πλόκαμος ὅδε καταστέφειν, here is my hair for you to wreathe. Eur. Iph. Aul. 1478.

Even in prose, the Infinitive occasionally occurs after εἰμί in this sense, as in PLAT. Phaedr. 229 Α, ἐκεῖ πόα καθίζεσθαι (sc. ἔστιν), there is grass to sit upon. See also ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙΙ, 1, 6, πολλαὶ δὲ καὶ πέλται καὶ ἄμαξαι ἦσαν φέρεσθαι ἔρημοι, i. e. they were left to be carried away (for fuel). See the last examples under § 97.

Note 2. As $\&\sigma\tau\epsilon$ is seldom used in Homer in its sense of so as (§ 98, N. 3), the simple Infinitive may there express a result as well as a purpose. It thus follows many expressions which would not allow it in Attic Greek. E. g.

Τίς τ' ἄρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι; i. e. who brought them into conflict, so as to contend? II. I, 8. So I, 151; and ἐριζέμεναι, II, 214. ἀλλὶ ὅτε δὴ κοίλη νηῦς ἤχθετο τοῖσι νέεσθαι, when now their ship was loaded, so as (to be ready) to start. Od. XV, 457. Χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχόω ἐπέχευε φέρουσα, νίψασθαι, i. e. for washing. Od. I, 138.

NOTE 3. In Homer and Herodotus we often find eval introduced to denote a purpose, where in Attic Greek a simple noun, as a predicate accusative or nominative, connected directly with the leading verb, would be sufficient. E. g.

Θώρηκα, τόν ποτέ οἱ Κινύρης δῶκε ξεινήιον εἶναι, i. e. which they gave him as a present (lit. to be a present). Π. ΧΙ, 20. Δίθον εἴλετο χειρὶ παχείη, τόν β΄ ἄνδρες πρότεροι θέσαν ἔμμεναι οὖρον ἀρούρης, which they had placed (to be) as a boundary. Π. ΧΧΙ, 405. Δαριῖος καταστήσας ᾿Αρταφέρνεα ὕπαρχον εἶναι Σαρδίαν. ΗDT. V, 25.

So in the passive construction: — Γέλων ἀπεδεχθη πάσης τῆς ἵππου είναι ἵππαρχος. Η DT. VII, 154.

Even in Attic prose this use of εἶναι sometimes occurs; as in Dem. Aph. III, 852, 12, Μνημονεύουσιν ἀφεθέντα τοῦτον ἐλεύθερον εἶναι τότε, they remember his having been then manumitted so as to be a freeman. So ἀφίησιν αὐτὰ δημόσια εἶναι, Thuc. II, 13.

NOTE 4. The use of the Infinitive after the comparative and η_i , then, is to be referred to this principle. E. g.

"Η ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις ἀσθενεστέρα ἢ λαβεῖν τέχνην ὧν ἃν ἢ ἄπειρος, human nature is too weak to acquire the art of those things of which it has no experience. Plat. Theaet. 149 C. Τὸ γὰρ νόσημα μεῖζον ἢ Φέρειν, i. e. too great to bear. Soph. O. T. 1293.

"Ωστε is sometimes expressed before this Infinitive; as in Xen. Hell. IV, 8, 23, "Ηισθοντο αὐτὸν ἐλάττω ἔχοντα δύναμιν ἢ ὥστε τοὺς φίλους ὡ φελεῖν.

So, rarely, ωs in the sense of ωστε (§ 98, Note i); as in Cyr. VI, 4, 17, Tas ἀσπίδας μείζους εχουσιν η ως ποιείν τι και ὁραν.

§ 98. 1. The Infinitive is used after ωστε, so that, so as, to express a result. E. g.

Ην πεπαιδευμένος ούτως ώστε πάνυ μικρά κεκτημένος πάνυ ραδίως εχειν άρκοῦντα, he had been educated so as very easily to have enough, although he possessed very little. XEN. Mem. I, 2, 1. Φῦναι δὲ δ Κύρος λέγεται Φιλοτιμότατος, ώστε πάντα μέν πόνον ανατλήναι, πάντα δὲ κίνδυνον ὑπομεῖναι. Id. Cyr. I, 2, 1. Απέχρη γὰρ αν τοῖς γνωσθείσιν έμμενειν, ωστε μηδεμίαν ήμιν είναι πρός τούτον διαφοράν, so that we should have no difference with him. DEM. Aph. I, 813, 4. Πολλας έλπίδας έχω αρκούντως έρειν, ώστε ύμας μήτ' απολειφθηναι τῶν πραγμάτων μήτ' ἀγνοῆσαι, κ.τ.λ. Ιδ. 813, 20. Τοιοῦτον έθος ημίν παρέδοσαν, ωστε... συνελθείν ές ταὐτόν. Isoc. Pan. p. 49 B. § 43. See Pan. § 45, τοσοῦτόν ἐστιν, ώστε καὶ τοῦτο περιείληφθαι. Πείσομαι γάρ οὐ τοσοῦτον οὐδὲν ὥστε μη οὐ καλῶς θανεῖν. Soph. Ant. 97. Σὐ δὲ σχολάζεις, ὥστε θανμάζειν ἐμέ. EUR. Hec. 780. Μηδ' ή βία σε μηδαμώς νικησάτω τοσόνδε μισείν ὥστε τὴν δίκην πατείν. SOPH. Aj. 1335. Λόγων καὶ βουλευμάτων κοινωνον αν σε ποιοίντο, ωστε μηδε έν σε λελη θέναι ων βουλόμεθα είδέναι, so that not a single one of the things we wish to know should have escaped you. Xen. Cyr. VI, 1, 40. (See § 18, 3, b.) Δυσκολία και μανία πολλάκις είς την διάνοιαν εμπίπτυυσιν ούτως ώστε και τας επιστήμας εκβάλλειν. Id. Mem. III, 12, 6. 'Αποληφθέντος, ώστε μη αν δύνασθαι επανελθείν οικαδε. Dem. Chers. 98, 25. (For δύνασθαι αν see N. 4.)

See § 93, 1, Note 1, last example.

REMARK. When the result is to be stated as an independent fact, rather than merely as a result, the Indicative is used after ωστε. See § 65, 3.

2. The Infinitive after $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ sometimes denotes a condition, being equivalent to the Infinitive after $\dot{\epsilon} \phi$ $\dot{\phi}$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \phi$ $\dot{\phi}$ $\dot{\tau} \epsilon$; and sometimes it denotes a purpose, like a final cause. E. g.

Ποιοῦνται όμολογίαν πρὸς Πάχητα, & στε 'Αθηνα οις έξείναι βου-

λεῦσαι περι τῶν Μυτιληναίων, they make a treaty with Paches, to the effect that the Athenians shall be permitted, &c. Thuc. III, 28. (See Thuc. III, 114, ξυμμαχίαν ἐποιήσαντο ἐπὶ τοῖσδε, ὥστε....μη στρατεύειν.) Έξὸν αὐτοῖς τῶν λοιπῶν ἄρχειν Ἑλλήνων, ὧστ ἀὐτοῦς ὑπα κού ειν βασιλεῖ, it being in their power to rule the rest of the Greeks, on condition that they should themselves serve the King. Dkm. Phil. II, 68, 12. Πῶν ποιοῦσιν, ὥστε δίκην μὴ διδόναι, they do everything, so that they may not suffer punishment. Plat. Gorg. 479 C. (Here Γνα μἡ with the Subjunctive might have been used.) Ἐβουλήθησαν Ἑλευσῖνα ἐξιδιώσασθαι, ὥστε εἶναι σφίσι καταφυγὸς ἐ δείσειε. ΧΕΝ. Hell. II, 4, 8. Μηχαναὶ πολλαί εἰσιν, ὥστε διαφεύγειν θάνατον, there are many devices for escaping death. Plat. Apol. 39 A. (See § 92, 1, N. 2.)

NOTE 1. ' Ω_s is sometimes used with the Infinitive instead of $\delta_{\sigma\tau\epsilon}$; generally, however, to express a *result*, seldom to express a *purpose*. E. g.

Ύψηλὸν δὲ οὖτω δή τι λέγεται, ὡς τὰς κορυφὰς αὐτοῦ οὐχ οἶά τε εἶναι ἰδέσθαι, and it (the mountain) is said to be so high, that it is not possible to see its summits. Hdt. IV, 184. Ναυμαχήσαντες ἀντίπαλα μὲν καὶ ὡς αὐτοὺς ἑκατέρους ἀξιοῦν νικᾶν, and so that each thought themselves the victors. Thuc. VII, 34. Βιασόμεθα, ὡς πλεονεκτοῦντ**ες** δίκην μὴ διδόναι. Plat. Rep. II, 365 D. Ὁ ποταμὸς τοσοῦτος τὸ βάθος, ὡς μηδὲ τὰ δόρατα ὑπερέχειν τοῦ βάθους. Χέν. An. III, 5, 7. So II, 3, 10. Φέρονται κώθωνα, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀρύσασθαι. Id. Cyr. I, 2, 8. Ἐν τῷ ἀσφαλεῖ ἤδη ἔσονται, ὡς μηδὲν ἄν ἔτι κακὸν παθεῖν. Ib. VIII, 7, 27. (For παθεῖν ἄν see N. 4.)

Note 2. The Infinitive with $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ or ω_5 is sometimes used where we should expect a simple Infinitive, either after the adjectives and adverbs included in § 93, or after the verbs and expressions which take the Infinitive of the object (§ 92, 1, and N. 2); and rarely after those which regularly take an Infinitive as the subject (§ 91). E. g.

Πότερα παΐδές εἰσι φρονιμώτεροι ὅστε μαθεῖν τὰ φραζόμενα ἡ ἄνδρες; i. e. are they wiser than men in learning, &c.? XEN. Cyr. IV, 3, 11. 'Ολίγοι ἐσμὲν ὡς ἐγκρατεῖς εἶναι αὐτῶν. Ib. IV, 5, 15. (Cf. δλίγαι ἀμῦνειν, too few to make a defence. Thuc. I, 50.) Ψυχρόν (ἐστι τὸ ὕδωρ) ὥστε λούσασθαι, the water is cold for bathing. XEN. Mem. III, 13, 3. (Cf. λούσασθαι ψυχρότερον, and θερμότερον πιεῖν, in the same section.) Ψηφισάμενοι αὐτοῦ πρῶτοι ὡστε πάση προθυμία ἀμῦνειν, having voted to defend them, &c. Τπυc. VI, 88. Εἰς ἀνάγκην καθέσταμεν ὡστε κινδυνεύειν. Isoc. Archid. p. 126 C. § 51. (See § 92, 1, N. 2) So δύναμιν ὡστε ἐγγενέσθαι, Ρίλπ. Rep. IV, 433 Β. Ἑλθόντες πρὸς αὐτοὺς πείθουσιν ὡστε μετὰ σφῶν Ἄργει ἐπιχειρῆσαι. Τπυc. III, 102. (In the same chapter, πείθει ᾿Ακαρνᾶνας βοηθῆσαι Ναυπάκτω.)
Πάνι μοι ἐμέλησεν ὡστε εἰδέναι, it concerned me very much to

know. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VI, 3, 19. 'Αδύνατον ὑμῖν ὧστε Πρωταγόρου τοῦδε σοφώτερόν τινα ἐλέσθαι. Plat. Prot. 338 C. So XEN. Mem. I, 3, 6.

- Note 3. In Homer $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ is generally used like $\delta \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$, in the sense of as. It occurs with the Infinitive, in the sense of so as, only twice: Il. IX, 42; Od. XVII, 21. ' Ω_S , so as, so that, is not found in Homer, who generally uses the simple Infinitive where later writers would insert $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ or δs . (See § 97, N. 2.)
- NOTE 4. The Infinitive after $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$ may take the adverb $\delta \nu$ to form an apodosis, whenever an Indicative or Optative, if used in the place of the Infinitive, would have required an $\delta \nu$. (See § 65, 3, Note.) The Infinitive with $\delta \nu$ here, as in indirect quotations, fol lows the general rule stated in § 41. (See example in § 41, N. 4; and the last examples under § 98, 1 and § 98, 2, N. 1.)
- Note 5. It will be seen that the Present and Aorist are the tenses of the Infinitive regularly used after $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$. For the perfect see § 18, 3, and Note; and for the Future, § 27, N. 2 (b).
- § 99. The Infinitive is used after $\dot{\epsilon}\phi'$ $\dot{\phi}$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\phi'$ $\dot{\phi}\tau\epsilon$, on condition that, for the purpose of. E. g.

Εἶπεν ὅτι σπείσασθαι βούλοιτο, ἐψ' ῷ μήτε αὐτὸς τοὺς Ἦληνας ἀδικεῖν μήτε ἐκείνους καίειν τὰς οἰκίας, λαμβάνειν τε τὰπιτήδεια ὅσων δέοιντο. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΙV, 4, 6. Πῶς ἂν οὖτος ἐθέλοι τὰ ἀλλότρια ἀποστερεῖν ἐψ' ῷ κακόδοξος εἶναι; Ιd. Ages. IV, 1. ᾿Αφίεμέν σε, ἐπὶ τούτῳ μέντοι, ἐψ' ῷτε μηκέτι φιλο σο φεῖν. Plat. Apol. 29 C. Αἰρεθέντες ἐψ' ὧτε ξυγγράψαι νόμους, καθ' οὖστινας πολιτεύσοιντο ΧΕΝ. Hell. II, 3, 11. (For πολιτεύσοιντο, see § 65, 1, Ν. 1.) Ἐψ' ῷτε βοηθήσειν. ΑΕSCHIN. Cor. § 114. See § 27, Ν. 2 (b).

For the Future Indicative after $\dot{\epsilon}\phi'$ $\dot{\phi}$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\phi'$ $\dot{\phi}\tau\epsilon$, especially in Herodotus and Thucydides, see § 65, 2.

§ 100. The Infinitive may stand absolutely in parenthetical phrases, sometimes alone, but generally preceded by ωs or ὅσον. E. g.

Τὸ Δέλτα ἐστὶ κατάρρυτόν τε καὶ νεωστὶ, ὡς λόγω εἰπεῖν, ἀναπεφηνός, i. e. recently, so to speak. Hdt. Π , 15. (This expression ὡς λόγω εἰπεῖν is peculiar to Herodotus.) Καὶ ὡς ἐμὲ εὖ μεμνῆσθαι, τὰ ὁ ἐρμηνεύς μοι ἐπιλεγόμενος τὰ γράμματα ἔφη, ας I well remember, &c. Id. II, 125. ὑας μέν νυν ἐν ἐλαχίστω δηλῶσαι, πῶν εἴρηται ὑ... ὡς δὲ ἐν πλέονι λόγω δηλῶσαι, δδε ἔχει. Id. II, 25. Μετὰ δὲ, οὐ πολλῷ λόγω εἰπεῖν, χρόνος διέφυ. Id. I, 61. Καὶ ἔργον, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ἡ οὐδενὸς προσδέονται ἡ βραχέος πάνυ. Plat. Gorg. 450 D. ὑας δὲ συντόμως εἰπεῖν, to speak concisely. XEN. Oec. XII, 19. ὑας δὲ συνελόντι εἰπεῖν. Id. Mem. III, 8, 20

Χώρος δ' δδ' ἰρὸς, ὡς ἀπεικάσαι. Soph. O. C. 16. Καὶ τὸ ξύμπαν εἰπεῖν. Thuc. I, 138. (So VI, 82, ἐς τὸ ἀκριβὲς εἰπεῖν.) 'Ως μικρὸν μεγάλω εἰκάσαι. Id. IV, 36. ''Ως γ' ἐμοὶ χρ,ῆσθαι κριτῆ. Eur. Alc. 801. 'Ως πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰρῆσθαι, i. e. between us. Plat. Rep. X, 595 B. Οὐδ' ἐγὼ ψέγω τούτους, ὡς γε διακόνους εἶναι τόλεως. Plat. Gorg. 517 B. 'Οσον γέ με εἰδέναι, at least as far as land the sum of 1 know. Id. Theaet. 145 A.

So ώς έμοι δοκείν or έμοι δοκείν, like ώς έμοι δοκεί, as it seems

to me; $\partial \lambda i yov \delta \in i\nu$, to want little, i. e. almost. (See N. 1.)

REMARK. The force of ωs in this construction can hardly be expressed in English, although it resembles that of as used for wore in § 98, 2, Note 1. That it is not a demonstrative, as might be supposed from the translation of ws eineiv, so to speak, is plain from such expressions as ως συντόμως είπειν, to speak concisely.

NOTE 1. In the phrase olivou deiv (lit. to want little), little short of, almost, deiv is often omitted, so that the genitive ολίγου stands alone in the sense of almost. E. g.

'Ολίγου φρούδος γεγένημαι, I am almost gone. Arist. Nub. 722. The full form is found at the beginning of DEM. Phil. III, - IIohλών λόγων γιγνομένων όλίγου δείν καθ έκάστην έκκλησίαν, i. e. in almost every meeting.

NOTE 2. In the phrase έκων είναι (sometimes το έκων elvai), willing or willingly, elvai appears to be superfluous: the phrase is used chiefly in negative sentences. Eivat appears superfluous also in such expressions as τὸ νῦν είναι, at present, τὸ τήμερον είναι, to-day, and τὸ ἐπ' ἐκείνοις είναι, as far as depends on them. E. g.

Έκων γάρ είναι οὐδὲν ψεύσομαι, willingly I will tell no falsehood. PLAT. Symp. 215 A. Οὐκ ὤμην γε κατ' ἀρχὰς ὑπὸ σοῦ ἐκόντος εἶναι ἐξαπατηθήσεσθαι. Id. Gorg. 499 C. (᾿Ανάγκη ἔχειν) τὴν ἀψεύδειων καὶ τὸ έκόντας είναι μηδαμή προσδέχεσθαι τὸ ψεῦδος. Id. Rep. VI, 485 C. 'Απόχρη μοι τὸ νον είναι ταῦτ' εἰρηκέναι. Isoc. Antid. p. 119, § 270. Το έπ' ἐκείνοις είναι ἀπωλώλειτε. ΧΕΝ. Hell. III, 5, 9. Τὸ μέν τήμερον είναι χρήσασθαι αὐτῆ, to use it to-day. Plat. Crat 396 E. Κατὰ τοῦτο εἶναι, in this respect. Id. Prot. 317 A.

Similar is the expression την πρώτην είναι (for την πρώτην), at first, in HDT. I, 153. So ωs πάλαια είναι, considering their antiquity. THUC. I, 21.

The Infinitive is sometimes used in the sense of the Imperative, especially in Homer.

Τφ νῦν μή ποτε καὶ σὺ γυναικί περ ήπιος είναι · μή οἱ μῦθον ἄπαντα πιφαυσκέμεν, ον κ' εὐ είδης, άλλα το μέν φάσθαι, το δέ και κεκρυμμένον είναι, now therefore be thou never indulgent to thy wife, &c. Od. XI, 441. So II. I, 20, 582; II, 10: Hdt. I, 32 (ἐπισχέειν μηδὲ καλέειν): Aesch. Prom. 712. Σὰ δὲ τὰs πύλας ἀνοίξας ὑπεκθεῖν καὶ ἐπείγεσθαι, and do you, having opened the gates, rush out and press on. Thuc. V, 9.

REMARK. It will be noticed that, when the Infinitive stands for the Imperative, its subject is in the nominative, but in the four constructions that follow (§§ 102-105) its subject is in the accusative.

§ 102. The Infinitive is sometimes used for the Optative in the expression of a wish referring to the future. This occurs chiefly in poetry. E. g.

Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἢ Αἴαντα λαχεῖν ἢ Τυδέος υἰόν, Father Zeus, may the lot fall on Ajax or on the son of Tydeus. II. VII, 179. 'Ερμᾶ μπολαῖε, τὰν γυναῖκα τὰν ἐμὰν οὕτω μ' ἀποδόσθαι τάν τ' ἐμαυτοῦ ματέρα, O that I could sell my wife and my mother at this rate! Arist. Acharn. 816. Θεοί πολῖται, μή με δουλείας τυχεῖν. ΑΕΒCH. Sept. 253.

§ 103. In laws, treaties, proclamations, and formal commands, the Infinitive is often used in the leading sentences, depending on some word like ἔδοξε or δέ-δοκται, be it enacted, or κελεύεται, it is commanded; which may be either understood, or expressed in a preceding sentence. E. g.

Ταμίας δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων αἰρεῖσθαι μὲν ἐκ τῶν μεγίστων τιμημάτων τὴν δὲ αῖρεσιν τούτων καὶ τὴν δοκιμασίαν γίγνεσθαι καθάπερ ἡ τῶν στρατηγῶν ἐγίγνετο, and (be it enacted) that treasures of the sacred funds be chosen, &c. Plat. Leg. 759 E. So in most of the laws (genuine or spurious) standing as quotations in the text of the Orators, as in Dem. Aristocr. 627, 21: Δικάζειν δὲ τὴν ἐν ᾿Αρείω πάγω φόνου καὶ τραύματος ἐκ προνοίας, κ.τ.λ. Ἦτη δὲ εἶναι τὰς σπονδὰς πεντήκοντα, and that the treaty shall continue fifty years. Thuc. V, 18. ᾿Ακούετε λεῷ τοὺς ὁπλίτας νυνμενὶ ἀνελομένους θῶπλα ἀπιέναι πάλιν οἴκαδε. Arist. Αν. 448.

§ 104. The Infinitive, with or without 76, is used in expressions of surprise or indignation. E. g.

Τὸ δὲ μηδὲ κυνῆν οἴκοθεν ἐλθεῖν ἐμὲ τὸν κακοδαίμον ἔχοντα, but to think that I, wretched fellow, should have come from home without even my cap! ARIST. Nub. 268. Τοῦτον δὲ ἡβρίζειν; ἀναπνεῖν δέ;

δν εἴ τις ἐᾶ ζῆν, ἀγαπῶν ἔδει. DEM. Mid. 582, 2. Τῆς μωρίας · τδ Δία νομίζειν, ὅντα τηλικουτονί, what folly! to believe in Zeus, now you are so big! Arist. Nub. 819.

Compare Verg. Aen. I, 37: Mene incepto desistere victam.

§ 105. In narration the Infinitive often appears to stand for the Indicative. It depends, however, on some word like λέγεται, it is said, expressed (or at least implied) in something that precedes. E. g.

'Απικομένους δὲ τοὺς Φοίνικας ἐς δὴ τὸ 'Αργος τοῦτο, διατίθεσθαι τὸν φόρτον, and (they say) that the Phoenicians, when now they were come to this Argos, were setting out their cargo for sale. HDT. I, I. (Here διατίθεσθαι is an Imperfect Infinitive, § 15, 3.) "'Αλλ', δ παῖ," φάναι τὸν 'Αστυάγην, "οὐκ ἀχθόμενοι ταῦτα περιπλανόμεθαι" "'Αλλὰ καὶ σέ," φάναι τὸν Κῦρον, "όρῶ," κ.τ.λ.... Καὶ τὸν 'Αστυάγην ἐσερέσθαι, "καὶ τίνι δὴ σὰ τεκμαιρόμενος λέγεις;" "'Ότι σε," φάναι, "όρῶ," κ.τ.λ.... Πρὸς ταῦτα δὲ τὸν 'Αστυάγην εἰπεῖν, κ.τ.λ. Καὶ τὸν Κῦρον εἰπεῖν, κ.τ.λ. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. I, 3, 5 and 6. (Here all these Infinitives, and twelve others which follow, depend on λέγεται in § 4.) Καὶ τὸν κελεῦσαι δοῦναι, and he commanded him to give it. Id. I, 3, 9. So in HDT. I, 24 the story of Arion and the dolphin is told in this construction, the Infinitives all depending on à single λέγουσι at the beginning. See § 101, Remark.

§ 106. $\Pi \rho l \nu$, before, before that, until, besides taking the Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative, like $\epsilon \omega s$ (§ 66), is also followed by the Infinitive.

For the use of the finite moods after $\pi \rho i \nu$, see § 67.

1. In Homer the Infinitive follows $\pi \rho i \nu$ after both affirmative and negative sentences. E. g.

Ναῖε δὲ Πήδαιον πρὶν ἐλ θ εῖν υἶας 'Αχαιῶν. Π. ΧΙΠ, 172. "Εφθη ὀρεξάμενος πρὶν οὐτάσαι, οὐδ' ἀφάμαρτεν. Π. ΧVI, 322. Σφῶιν δὲ πρίν περ τρόμος ἔλλαβε φαίδιμα γυῖα, πρὶν πόλεμόν τ' ἰδεειν πολέμοιό τε μέρμερα ἔργα, before they saw the war, &c. Π. VIII, 452. (See Note 4.) Φεύγει πρίν περ ὅμιλον ἀολλισθήμεναι ἀνδρῶν. Π. ΧV, 588. Ή κ' ἔτι πολλοὶ γαῖαν όδὰξ εἶλον πρὶν "Ίλιον εἰσαφικέσθαι. Π. ΧΧΙΙ, 17. 'Αλλά οἱ αὐτῷ Ζεὺς ὀλέσειε βίην πρὶν ἡμῖν πῆμα φυτεῦσαι. Οd. ΙV, 668. Αἴθ' ἄφελλ'... ἄλλοθ' ὀλέσθαι πρὶν ἐλθεῖν. Od. ΧΥΙΙΙ, 402. Οὐ λήξω πρὶν Τρῶας ἄδην ἐλάσαι πολέμοιο. Π. ΧΙΧ, 423. Οὐδέ τι θυμῷ τέρπετο πρὶν πολέμου στόμα δύμεναι αἰματόεντος. Π. ΧΙΧ, 813. Οὐδ' ἀπολήγει πρὶν χροὸς ἀνδρεμέσιο διελθεῖν. Π. ΧΧ, 100. Οὕ μ' ἀποτρέψεις πρὶν χαλκῷ μαχέσα»

σθαι. Π. ΧΧ, 257. Μηδ' ἀντίος ἵστασ' ἐμεῖο πρίν τι κακὸν παθέειν. Π. ΧΧ, 198.

See § 67, Note 1.

2. Writers later than Homer use the Infinitive after $\pi \rho i \nu$ chiefly when the leading sentence is affirmative. E. g.

Ποὶν ών παρείναι ἐκείνον ἐς τὴν Αττικὴν, ὑμέως καιρός ἐστι προ-Βωθήσαι ές την Βοιωτίαν, before he comes into Attica, &c. HDT. VIII, 143. Οδον εδρεν τεσσαράκοντα καὶ όκτὼ παρθένοισι, πρὶν μέσον ἄμαρ ελείν, ἀκύτατον γάμον. PIND. Pyth. IX, 196. Πρίν νθν τὰ πλείον ίστορεῖν, ἐκ τῆσδ' ἔδρας ἔξελθε, before seeking further, &c. SOPH. O. C. 36. 'Αποπέμπουσιν οὖν αὐτὸν πρὶν ἀκοῦσαι. Thuc. II, 12. So ΙΙ, 13, πρὶν ἐσβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Αττικήν. Αφίεσαν τὰ βέλη πολύ πρὶν έξικνείσθαι. Χεη. Cyr. III, 3, 60. Πρίν μεν οθν έχεσθαι τα ἄκρα οὐδεν εδείσθε εἰρήνης. Ιb. III, 2, 12. Ἡμείς τοίνυν Μεσσήνην είλομεν πρίν Πέρσας λαβείν την βασιλείαν και κρατήσαι της ηπείρου, καὶ πρὶν οἰκισθηναί τινας τῶν πόλεων τῶν Ἑλληνίδων. Isoc. Archid. p. 121 A. § 26. Καὶ πρὶν έξ μῆνας γεγονέναι, ἀπέδωκε. PLAT. Prot. 320 A. 'Απωλόμεσθ' ἄρ', εὶ κακὸν προσοίσομεν νέον παλαιώ, ποιν τόδ' έξηντληκ έναι, we are ruined then, if we shall add a new calamity to the former one, before we shall have exhausted EUR. Med. 79. (See § 18, 3.) that.

Note 1. The Infinitive after $\pi \rho i \nu$ was probably not accompanied by $\tilde{a} \nu$. (See Krüger's note on Hdt. I, 140.)

Note 2. $\Pi \rho l \nu$ with the Infinitive after negative sentences is rare in the Attic poets, but more frequent in the Attic prose. (See § 67, Note 2.) E. g.

Οὐκ ἂν μεθεῖτο, πρὶν καθ' ἡδονὴν κλύειν. SOPH. Tr. 197. Πρὶν ἰδεῖν δ', οὐδεὶς μάντις τῶν μελλόντων, ὅ τι πράξει. Id. Aj. 1418. So AESCH. Sept. 1048, Agam. 1067; ARIST. Av. 964. Καὶ δι' αὐτὸ οὐ πρὶν πάσχειν, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ ἐσμὲν, τοὺς ξυμμάχους τούσδε παρεκαλέσατε. ΤΗυς. I, 68. So I, 39; V, 10; VII, 50. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τούτων πρὶν μαθεῖν οὐδεὶς ἡπίστατο. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. IV, 3, 10. Αὔτη ἡ γυνὴ, πρὶν μὲν ὡς *Αφοβον ἐλθεῖν, μίαν ἡμέραν οὐκ ἐχήρευσεν. DEM. Onet. I, 873, 10.

Note 3. If $\rho i \nu \vec{\eta}$, $\pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu \vec{\eta}$ (priusquam), $\pi \rho \delta \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \vec{\eta}$, and even $\vec{\nu} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu \vec{\eta}$, like $\pi \rho i \nu$, may be followed by the Infinitive. (See § 67, Note 3.) E. g.

Οἱ δὲ Αἰγύπτιοι, πρὶν μὲν ἡ Ψαμμίτιχον σφέων βασιλεῦσαι, ἐνόμιζον έωυτοὺς πρώτους γενέσθαι πάντων ἀνθρώπων. Hdt. II, 2. Ἐπὶ τοὺς πομπέας πρότερον ἡ αἰσθέσθαι αὐτοὺς εὐθὺς ἐχώρησεν, before they perceived them. Thuc. VI, 58. So I, 69. Πρὶν δὲ ἀναστῆναι, ἔτεσιν ὕστερον ἑκατὸν ἡ αὐτοὺς οἰκῆσαι, Πάμμιλον πέμψαντες ἐς Σελινοῦντα, i. e. a hundred years after their own settlement. Id. VI, 4.

In Hdt. VI, 108 we find the Infinitive depending on $\phi\theta$ άνω ή, the verb implying πρότερον or πρίν: — ϕ θ α ί η τ ε αν εξανδραποδισθέντες ή τινα πυθέσθαι ἡμέων, you would be reduced to slavery before any of us would hear of it.

Note 4. $\Pi \rho i \nu$ or $\pi \rho i \nu$ $\ddot{\eta}$ is very often preceded by $\pi \rho \delta \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$, $\pi \rho \delta \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$, $\pi \delta \rho o s$, or another $\pi \rho i \nu$ (used as an adverb), qualifying the leading verb. (See § 67, Note 4.) E. g.

'Αποθνήσκουσι πρότερον πρὶν δῆλοι γίγνεσθαι οἶοι ἦσαν. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. V, 2, 9. Καὶ ὅμοσαν μὴ πρὶν ἐς Φώκαιαν ἥξειν πρὶν ἢ τὸν μύσορον τοῦτον ἀναπεφηνέναι. Ηρτ. Ι, 165. Πάρος δ' οὐκ ἔσσεται ἄλλως, πρίν γε ... νὼ πειρηθῆναι. Π. V, 220. Μὴ πρὶν ταράξης, πρὶν τόδ' εὖ θέσθαι, τέκνον. Ευκ. Herc. F. 605.

Note 5. $\Pi \acute{a} \rho os$, in the sense of $\pi \rho l \nu$, is used in Homer with the Infinitive, but never with the other moods. E. g.

Τέκνα ἀγρόται έξείλοντο πάρος πετεηνὰ γενέσθαι. Od. XVI, 218. Οὐδέ οἱ ῧπνος πῖπτεν ἐπὶ βλεφάροισι πάρος καταλέξαι ἄπαντα. Od. XXIII, 309.

REMARK. The rules for the tenses of the Infinitive are given in Chapter Second. It will be seen from a comparison of these, that the Present and Aorist are the only tenses ordinarily used in constructions in which the Infinitive in itself has no reference to time, that is, in all except indirect discourse. In indirect discourse each tense has its own force, as in the Indicative; but in other constructions the Perfect is used only in the cases mentioned in § 18, 3, b, and Note; and the Future only in the few cases mentioned in § 27, Note 2, a and b. (See § 27, Note 1.)

CHAPTER VI.

THE PARTICIPLE.

§ 107. The Participle has three distinct uses:—first, it may express a simple attribute, like an ordinary adjective (§ 108); secondly, it may define the circumstances under which the action of the sentence takes place (§§ 109-111); thirdly, it may form part of the predicate with certain verbs, often having a force resembling that of the Infinitive (§§ 112, 113).

REMARK. As the Infinitive may be considered as a verbal noun, so the Participle is always a verbal adjective; both alike retaining all the attributes of a verb which are consistent with their nature. See § 90.

§ 108. 1. The Participle, like any other adjective, may qualify a noun.

In such expressions it must often be translated by a finite verb and a relative, especially when the Participle is preceded by the article. E. g.

Πόλις κάλλει διαφέρουσα, a city excelling in beauty. 'Ανήρ καλώς $\pi \in \pi$ αιδευμένος, a man who has been well educated. Οἱ πρέσβεις οἱ παρὰ Φιλίππου $\pi \in \mu \varphi$ θέντες, the ambassadors who had been sent from Philip. "Ανδρες οἱ τοῦτο ποιήσοντες. men who will do this.

- Έν τῆ Μεσσηνία ποτε ο ὖση γῆ, in the land which was once Messenia. See § 16, 2. Στρατεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὰς Αἰόλου νήσους καλουμένας, they sail against the so-called Aeolian islands, lit. the islands called those of Aeolus. Thuc. III, 88. Αἱ ἄρισται δοκοῦσαι εἶναι ψύσεις, the natures which seem to be best. ΧΕΝ. Μεμ. IV, 1, 3. Αἱ πρὸ τοῦ στόματος νήει ναυμαχοῦσαι. ΤΗυς. VII, 23. Τὸν κατειλη φότα κίνδυνον τὴν πόλιν. DEM. Cor. 301, 28.
- 2. The Participle preceded by the article may be used substantively, like any other adjective. It is then equivalent to excivos os (he who) and a finite verb in the tense of the Participle. E. g.

Ol κρατοῦντες, the conquerors. Ol πεπεισμένοι, those who have beer convinced. Οὖτός ἐστι ὁ τοῦτο ποιήσας, this is the one who did it. Οὖτοί εἰσιν οἱ ὑμᾶς πάντας ἀδικήσοντες, these are the men who will

wrong you all.

Παρὰ τοῖς ἀρίστοις δοκοῦσιν εἶναι, among those who seem to be best. XEN. Mem. IV, 2, 6. Ἦν δὲ ὁ μὲν τὴν γνώμην ταύτην εἶπὰν Πείσανδρος, and Peisander was the one who gave this opinion. ΤΗυς. VIII, 68. Τοῖς ᾿Αρκάδων σφετέροις οὖσι ξυμμάχοις προεῖπον, they proclaimed to those of the Arcadians who were their allies. Id. V, 64. Αφεκτέον ἐγώ φημι εἶναι (τούτων) τῷ σωφρονεῖν δυνησομένω, for one who is to be able to be discreet. XEN. Symp. IV, 26.

NOTE 1. When the Participle, in either of these constructions, refers to a purpose or intention, it is generally Future, rarely Present. E. g.

Νόμον δημοσία τὸν ταῦτα κωλύσοντα τέθεινται τουτονί, they have publicly enacted this law, which is to prevent these things. Dem. Mid. 530, 10. Τῶν ἐργασομένων ἐνόντων, there being men in the country to cultivate it. ΧεΝ. Απ. Η, 4, 22. (See § 110, 1.) Ὁ ἡγησόμενος οὐδεὶς ἔσται there will be nobody who will lead us. Ib. II, 4, 5. Πολλούς ἔξομεν τοὺς ἐτοίμως συναγωνιζομένους ἡμῖν. Isoc. Pac. p. 186 D. § 139.

See the more common use of the Future Participle to express a purpose, § 109, 5.

Note 2. Participles, like adjectives, are occasionally used substantively even without the article, in an indefinite sense; but generally only in the plural. E. g.

"Επλει δώδεκα τριήρεις έχων ἐπὶ πολλὰς ναῦς κεκτημένους, he sailed with twelve triremes against men who had many ships. Xen. Hell. V, 1, 19. "Όταν πολεμούντων πόλις άλῶς, whenever a city of belligerents is taken. Id. Cyr. VII, 5, 73. Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀφικνοῦνταί μοι ἀπαγγέλλοντες ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ ἀφεῖται, there come messengers announcing, &c. Isoc. Trapez. p. 360 C. § 11. Είδες νοῦν ἔχοντα λυπούμενον καὶ χαίροντα; did you ever see a man of sense (sc. τινά) grieved and rejoicing? Plat. Gorg. 498 A.

Note 3. In the poets, the Participle with the article sometimes becomes so completely a substantive, that it is followed by an adnominal genitive rather than by the case which its verbal force would require. A few expressions like of προσήκοντες, relatives, and τὸ συμφέροντα στὰ συμφέροντα, gain, advantage, are used in the same way even in prose. E. g.

'O έκείνου τεκών, his father. Eur. El. 335. (We should expect ὁ έκείνον τεκών.) Τὰ μικρὰ συμφέροντα τῆς πόλεως, the small advantages of the state. Dem. Cor. 234, 26. Βασιλέως προσήκοντές τινες. ΤΗυς. I, 128.

NOTE 4. (a.) In the poets and in Thucydides, the neuter singular of the Present Participle with the article is sometimes used in the sense of an abstract verbal noun, where we should expect the Infinitive with the article. E. g.

Ἐν τῷ μὴ μελετῶντι ἀξυνετώτεροι ἔσονται, in the want of practice, &c. ΤΗυς. I, 142. (Here we should expect ἐν τῷ μὴ μελετᾶν.) Γνώτω τὸ μὲν δεδιὸς αὐτοῦ τοὺς ἐναντίους μᾶλλον φοβῆσον, τὸ δὲ ἀροροῦν... ἀδεέστερον ἐσόμενον. Id. I, 36. (Here τὸ δεδιὸς, fear, is used like τὸ δεδιέναι, and τὸ θαρσοῦν, courage, like τὸ δαρσεῖν οτ τὸ θάρσος.) Μετὰ τοῦ δρωμένου, with action. Id. V, 102. Καὶ σέ γ' εἰσάξω τὸ γὰρ νοσοῦν ποθεῖ σε ξυμπαραστάτην λαβεῖν. Soph. Phil. 674. (τὸ νοσοῦν = ἡ νύσος.) Τὸ γὰρ ποθοῦν ἔκαστος ἐκμαθεῖν θέλων οὐκ ἄν μεθεῖτο, πρὶν καθ' ἡδονὴν κλύειν. Soph. Trach. 196.

Compare the use of the neuter singular of an adjective for the corresponding abstract noun; as τὸ καλόν, beauty, for τὸ κάλλος.

(b.) A similar construction sometimes occurs when a Participle and a noun are used instead of an Infinitive and a noun, where in English we generally use a finite verb. E. g.

Μετὰ δὲ Σόλωνα οἰχόμενον ἔλαβε νέμεσις μεγάλη Κροῖσον, i. e. after Solon was gone. Hdt. I, 34. Τῆ πόλει οὕτε πολέμου κακῶς συμβάντος οὕτε στάσεως πώποτε αἴτιος ἐγένετο, i. e. the cause of a disastrous result of any war (like τοῦ πόλεμόν τινα κακῶς συμβῆναι). ΧΕΝ. Μεμ. I, 2, 63. So ἐς ἦελιον καταδύντα, Π. I, 601.

Remark. Such expressions as $\tau \delta$ κρατοῦν τῆς πόλεως, the ruling part of the state, $\tau \delta$ δοξάζον τῆς ψύχης, &c. must not be confounded with the examples belonging under Notes 3 and 4. They are merely cases of the partitive genitive after a participle used as a noun.

Note 5. Some Present Participles are occasionally used like predicate adjectives after $\epsilon i\mu i$ or $\gamma i\gamma \nu o\mu ai$. Such are especially $\delta ia-\phi \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$, $\epsilon \chi \omega \nu$ (with an adverb), $\pi \rho o\sigma \eta \kappa \omega \nu$, $\pi \rho \epsilon \pi \omega \nu$, $\delta \epsilon o\nu$, $\epsilon \xi \delta \nu$, and $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \rho o\nu$. E. g.

Τί ποτ' ἐστὶν οὖτος ἐκείνου διαφέρων; in what is this man different from that one? Plat. Gorg. 500 C. Συμφέρον ἢν τῷ πόλει, it was advantageous to the state. Dem. F. L. 364, 25. So after ὑπάρχω in Demosthenes; as τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς εἰδότας ἡγοῦμαι, for I think you are aware of this, Cor. 257, 25.

Note 6. The poets sometimes use a Present or Aorist Participle with $\epsilon l \mu i$ as a periphrasis for the simple form of the verb In prose each part of such expressions has its ordinary meaning. E. g.

*Aν η θέλουσα, πάντ' εμοῦ κομίζεται, whatever she wants, she always obtains from me. Soph. O. T. 580. (Here η θέλουσα is used for θέλη.) Οὐκ εἰς ὅλεθρον; νῦ σιωπήσας ἔσει; Ib. 1146. *Π τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστι γιγνόμενον παρ' ἡμῦν; or is not this something that

happens among us? Plat. Phileb. 39 C. Hν γὰρ δ Θεμιστοκλῆς βεβαιότατα δη φύσεως ἰσχὺν δηλώσας, καὶ ... ἄξιος θαυμάσαι, Themistocles was one who manifested, &c. Thuc. I, 138.

For the use of the Perfect Participle in the same way, see § 17, Note 2. For the Aorist Participle with $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ as a periphrasis for the Perfect Indicative, see below, § 112, Note 7.

§ 109. The Participle is used to define the *circumstances* under which an action takes place. It may in this sense be connected with any substantive in the sentence, and agree with it in case.

The relations expressed by the participle in this use are the following:—

1. Time, the various tenses of the Participle denoting various points of time, which are of course all referred to that of the leading verb. E. g.

Ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἀπήει, when he had said this, he departed. ᾿Απήντησα Φιλίππω ἀπιόντι, I met Philip as he was departing. Τοῦτο πεποιηκότες ἀπελεύσονται. Ταῦτα ἔπραττε στρατηγῶν, he did these things while he was general. Ταῦτα πράξει στρατηγῶν, he will do these things when he is general. Τυραννεύσας δὲ ἔτη τρία Ἱππίας ἐχώρει ὑπόσπονδος ἐς Σίγειον. ΤΗυς. VI. 59.

2. Means. E. g.

Ληιζόμενοι ζῶσιν, they live by plunder. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. III, 2, 25. Τοὺς Ἑλληνας ἐδίδαξαν, ὃν τρόπον διοικοῦντες τὰς αὐτῶν πατρίδας καὶ πρὸς οὖς πολεμοῦντες μεγάλην ἃν τὴν Ἑλλάδα ποιήσειαν. ISOC. Panath. p. 241 D. § 44. Οὐ γὰρ ἀλλοτρίοις ὑμῦν χρωμένοις παραδείγμασιν ἀλλ' οἶκείοις, εὐδαίμοσιν ἔξεστι γενέσθαι, by using not foreign but domestic examples, &c. Dem. Ol. III, 35, 1. (So often χρώμενος with the dative.)

3. Manner, and similar relations, including manner of employment, &c. E. g.

Προείλετο μάλλον τοις νόμοις έμμένων ἀποθανείν ἡ παρανομῶν ζῆν, he preferred to die abiding by the laws, rather than to live disobeying them. Xen. Mem. IV, 4, 4. 'Αρπάσαντας τὰ ὅπλα πορεύεσθαι, to march having snatched up their arms (i. e. eagerly). Dem. OI. III, 34, 8. Τοῦνο ἐποίησεν λαθών, he did this secretly. (See below, N. 8.) 'Απεδήμει τριηραρχών, he was absent on duty as trierarch.

4. Cause or ground of action. E. g.

Λέγω δὲ τοῦδ' ἔνεκα, βουλόμενος δόξαι σοὶ ὅπερ ἐμοί, and I speak jòr this reason, because I wish, &c. Plat. Phaed. 102 D. ᾿Απείχοντο κερδῶν, αἰσχρὰ νομίζοντες εἶναι, because they believed them to be base. ΧΕΝ. Μεπ. Ι, 2, 22. Τί γὰρ ὰν βουλόμενοι ἄνδρες σοφοὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς δεσπότας ἀμείνους αὐτῶν φεύγοιεν, with what object in view, &c. (i. e. wishing what)? Plat. Phaed. 63 A. (See below, Note 7.)

For the Participle with is, used to express a cause assigned by

another, see below, Note 4.

5. Purpose, object, or intention, expressed by the Future Participle, rarely by the Present. E. g.

"Ήλθε λυσόμενος θύγατρα, he came to ransom his daughter. II. I. 13. Παρελήλυθα συμβουλεύσων, I have risen to give my advice. Isoc. Archid. § 1. Έβουλεύσωντο πέμπειν ἐς Λακεδαίμονα πρέσβεις ταῦτά τε ἐροῦντας καὶ Λύσανδρον αἰτήσοντας ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς, in order to say this, and to ask for Lysander as admiral. ΧΕΝ. Hell. II, 6. Έὰν εἰς πόλεμον (ἡ πατρὶς) ἄγη τρωθησόμενον ἡ ἀποθανούμενον, ποιητέον ταῦτα, even if it lead any one into war to be wounded or to perish. PLAT. Crit. 51 B.

"Ετυχον γὰρ ai μὲν (νῆες) ἐπὶ Καρίας οἰχόμεναι, . . . περιαγγέλλουσαι βοηθεῖν, for some of the ships happened to be gone towards Caria, in order to give them notice to send aid. THUC. I, 116. So ἀρνύμενοι, Π. I, 159. (The Present here seems to express an attendant circumstance, rather than a mere purpose.)

6. Condition, the Participle standing for the protasis of a conditional sentence, and its tenses representing the various forms of protasis expressed by the Indicative, Subjunctive, or Optative (§ 52, 1). E. g.

Οἴει σὰ Ἦλκηστιν ὑπὲρ Ἰδλμήτου ἀποθανεῖν αν, ἢ Ἰλχιλλέα Πατρόκλω ἐπαποθανεῖν, μὴ οἴο μένο υς ἀθάνατον μνήμην ἀρετῆς πέρι ἐαυτῶν ἔσεσθαι, do you think that Alcestis would have died for Admetus, §c., if they had not believed, &c. Plat. Symp. 208 D. (Here μὴ οἰομένους is equivalent to εἰ μὴ ιροτο.) Οὐ γὰρ αν αὐτοῖς ἔμελεν μὴ τοῦτο ὑπολαμβάνου σιν, for it would not have concerned them, unless they had had this idea. Dem. Phil. III, 122, 21. (Here μὴ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν is equivalent to εἰ μὴ τοῦτο ὑπελάμβανον.) Ἦστρων αν ἔλθοιμ αἰθέρος πρὸς ἀντολὰς καὶ γῆς ἔνερθε, δυνατὸς ῶν δρασαι τάδε, if I should be able to do this (εἰ δυνατὸς εἴην). Eur. Phoen. 504.

See other examples under § 52, 1.

7. Opposition, or limitation, where the Participle is often to be translated by although. E. g.

ουτος δέ και μεταπεμφθήναι φάσκων ύπο του πατρός, και έλθων

εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, εἰσελθεῖν μὲν οὰ φησιν, Δημοφῶντος δ' ἀκοῦσαι γραμματεῖον ἀναγιγνώσκοντος, καὶ προεισεληλυθὼς καὶ ἄπαντα διωμιλογημένος πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, and this man, although he admits that he was summoned, and although he did go to the house, yet denies that he went in, ξc., although he had previously gone in and arranged everything with my father. DEM. Aph. II, 839, 29. 'Ολίγα δυνάμενος προορῶν περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος πολλὰ ἐπιχειροῦμεν πράττειν, although we are able to foresee few things, &c. ΧεΝ. Cyr. III, 2, 15.

The Participle in this sense is very often accompanied by καίπερ

and other particles. See below, Note 5.

8. Any attendant circumstance, the Participle being merely descriptive. E. g.

Kal π a ρ a λ a β όντες τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς ἐστράτευσαν ἐπὶ Φάρσαλον, and having taken the Boeotians with them, they marched against Pharsalus. ΤΗυς. Ι, 111. Παραγγέλλει τῷ Κλεάρχῷ λ a β όντι ἤκειν ὅσον ἤν αὐτῷ στράτευμα. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Ι, 2, 1. Ἦρχεται Μανδάνη τὸν Κῦρον τὸν υἰὸν ἔχουσα, Mandane comes with her son Cyrus. Id. Cyr. I, 3, 1. (See below, N. 8.)

Note 1. (a.) The adverbs $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon$, $\tilde{\eta} \delta \eta$ ($\tau \delta \tau \epsilon \tilde{\eta} \delta \eta$), $\epsilon \nu \tau a \hat{v} \theta a$, $\epsilon \tilde{t} \tau a$, and $o \tilde{v} \tau \omega s$ are often joined to the verb of the sentence in which the temporal Participle stands. E. g.

Ἐκέλευεν αὐτὸν συνδιαβάντα ἔπειτα οὕτως ἀπαλλάττεσθαι, he commanded that, after he had joined them in crossing, he should then retire as he proposed. ΧΕΝ. ΑΝ. VII, 1, 2. Πειθομένων δὲ τῶν Σαμίων καὶ σχόντων τὴν Ζάγκλην, ἐνθαῦτα οἱ Ζαγκλαῖοι ἐβοήθεον αὐτῆ. ΗΝΤ. VI, 23. ᾿Αποφυγὼν δὲ καὶ τούτους, στρατηγὸς οὕτω ᾿Αθηναίων ἀπεδέχθη, and having escaped these also, he was then chosen general of the Athenians. Id. VI, 104.

(b.) Εἶτα, ἔπειτα, and οὖτως sometimes refer in the same way to a Participle expressing opposition or limitation; in which case they may be translated by nevertheless, after all. E. g.

Πάντων δ' ἀτοπώτατόν ἐστι, τηλικαύτην ἀνελόντας μαρτυρίαν οὖτως οἴεσθαι δεῖν εἰκῆ πιστεύεσθαι παρ' ὑμῖν, that, although they have destroyed so important a piece of evidence, they after all think, &c. Dem. Aph. II, 837, 10. Δεινὰ μέντ' ἃν πάθοις, εἰ 'Αθήναζε ἀφικόμενος, οὖ τῆς Ἑλλάδος πλείστη ἐστὶν ἐξουσία τοῦ λέγειν, ἔπειτα σὺ ἐνταῦθα τούτου μόνος ἀτυχήσαις, if, although you are come to Athens, you should after all be the only one to fail in obtaining this. Plat. Gorg. 461 E.

(c.) Οὖτως, διὰ τοῦτο, and διὰ ταῦτα sometimes refer in the same way to a Participle denoting a cause. E. g.

Νομίζων ἀμείνονας καὶ κρείττους πολλῶν βαρβάρων ὑμᾶς εἶναι, διὰ τοῦτο προσέλαβον. ΧΕΝ. Απ. Ι, 7, 3.

Note 2. The Adverbs aµa, µεταξύ, εὐθύς, αὐτίκα, and ἐξαίφνητ are often connected (in position and in sense) with the temporal Participle, although grammatically they qualify the verb of the sentence. E. g.

"A μ α προιών ἐπεσκοπεῖτο εἴ τι δυνατὸν εἴη τοὺς πολεμίους ἀσθενεστέρους ποιεῖν, as he advanced, he looked at the same time to see whether it was possible, &c Xen. Cyr. V, 2, 22. "A μ α καταλαβόντες προσεκέατό σφι, as soon as they had overtaken them, they pressed hard upon them. Hdt. IX, 57. Νεκώς μεταξὺ ὀρύσσων ἐπαύσατο, μαντηίνι ἐμποδίων γενομένου, Necho stopped while digging (the canal), &c. Id. II, 158. Πολλαχοῦ δή με ἐπέσχε λέγοντα μεταξύ, it often checked me while speaking. Plat. Apol. 40 B. Ἐπιπόνω ἀσκήσει εὐθὺς νέοι ὅντες τὸ ἀνδρείον μετέρχονται, by toilsome discipline, even while they are still young, &c. ΤΗυς. II, 39. Τῷ δεξιῷ κέρα εὐθὺς ἀποβεβηκότι οί Κορίνθιοι ἐπέκειντο, the Corinthians pressed upon the right wing, as soon as it was disembarked. Id. IV, 43. 'Αρξάμενος εὐθὺς καθισταμένου, beginning as soon as it (the war) broke out. Id. I, 1. Διόνυσον λέγουσι ὡς αὐτίκα γενόμενον ἐς τὸν μηρὸν ἐνερράψατο Ζεύς, they say of Dionysus that, as soon as he was born, Zeus sewed him into his thigh. Hdt. II, 146. Τὴν ψυχὴν θεωρῶν ἐξαίφνης ἀποθανόντος ἐκάστον, viewing the soul of each one the moment that he is dead. Plat. Gorg. 523 E.

- Note 3. (a.) "A $\tau\epsilon$, of $o\nu$, or of a, as, inasmuch as, are used to emphasize a Participle denoting the cause or ground of an action. Here the cause assigned is stated merely on the authority of the speaker or writer. (See N. 4.) E. g.
- 'Ο δὲ Κῦρος, ἄτε παῖς ὧν καὶ φιλόκαλος καὶ φιλότιμος, ήδετο τῆ στολῆ, but Cyrus, inasmuch as he was a child, &c. Xen. Cyr. I, 8, 3. So ἄτε ληφθέντων, Thuc. VII, 85. Μάλα δὲ χαλεπῶς πορευόμενοι, οἶα δὴ ἐν νυκτί τε καὶ φόβω ἀπιόντες, εἰς Αἰγόσθενα ἀφικνοῦνται, inasmuch as they were departing by night, &c. Xen. Hell. VI, 4, 26.

In Herodotus ὥστε is used in the same sense; as in I, 8, ὥστε αῦτα νομίζων, inasmuch as he believed this. See Thuc. VII, 24.

(b.) " $\Omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ with the Participle occasionally seems to have the same force as $\mathring{\sigma} \epsilon \epsilon$ or o $\mathring{\delta} \nu$; as in Eur. Hippol. 1307, \mathring{o} \mathring{o} \mathring{o} $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ \mathring{o} ν \mathring{o} kalos où \mathring{e} \mathring{e} $\mathring{\phi}$ \mathring{e} $\mathring{\sigma}$ \mathring{e} \mathring{e} \mathring{e} \mathring{o} in asmuch as he was just, &c.

For the common use of $\delta \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ with the Participle, see Note 9.

Note 4. (a) 'Os may be prefixed to many of the Participles of § 109, especially those denoting a cause or a purpose. It shows that the Participle expresses the idea of the subject of the leading verb, or that of some other person prominently mentioned in the sentence; without implying that it is also the idea of the speaker or writer. E. g.

Τὸν Περικλέα ἐν αἰτία είχον ὡς πείσαντα σφάι πολεμείν καὶ δι εκείνου ταις ξυμφοραις περιπεπτωκότες, they jound fault with Pericles, on the ground that he had persuaded them to engage in the war, and that through him they had met with the calamities. THUC. (Here Thucydides himself is not responsible for the statements made by the Participles: as he would be if is were omitted.) See § 111. 'Ανανακτοῦσιν ως μεγάλων τινων απεστερημένο, they are indignant, because (as they allege) they have been deprived, &c. Plat. Rep. I, 329 A. Βασιλεί χάριν ίσασιν, ώς δι εκείνον τυχού σαι της αὐτονομίας ταύτης, i. e. they thank him because (as they believe) they have obtained this independence through him. Isoc. Pan. p. 77 C. § 175. Οἱ μὲν διώκοντες τοὺς καθ' αὐτοὺς ὡς πάντας νικῶντες, οἱ δ' άρπάζοντες ως ήδη πάντες νικώντες, one side pursuing those opposed to them, thinking that they were victorious over all; and the other side proceeding to plunder, thinking that they were all victorious. XEN. An. Ι, 10, 4. Τὴν πρόφασιν ἐποιεῖτο ὡς Πισίδας βουλόμενος ἐκβαλεῖν, he made his pretence, (apparently) wishing to drive out the Pisidians. Ib. I, 2, 1. Ελεγε θαρρείν ως καταστησομένων τούτων είς τὸ δέον, he said he took courage, on the ground that these matters were about to be settled, &c. Ib. I, 3, 8. (See § 110, 1, N. 1.) 'as yap είδότων περίων επέμφθησαν ακούετε, for you hear them as men who (as you believe) know about what they were sent for. Dem. F. L. 342, Οἱ 'Αθηναῖοι παρεσκευάζοντο ώς πολεμήσοντες, the Athenians prepared with the (avowed) intention of going to war. Thuc. II, 7. Συλλαμβάνει Κύρον ως ἀποκτενων, he seizes Cyrus with the (avowed) object of putting him to death. XEN. An. I, 1, 3.

It is a common mistake to suppose that &s implies that the Participle does not express the idea of the speaker or writer. It implies nothing whatever on this point, which is determined (if at all) by the

context.

(b.) 'Os may also be used before Participles with verbs of knowing, &c., included in § 113. (See § 113, N. 10.)

Note 5. (a.) The Participle expressing opposition or limitation is often strengthened by $\kappa a i \pi \epsilon \rho$ or $\kappa a i$ (after a negative, by o i o i o i multiple with or without $\pi \epsilon \rho$), $\kappa a i \tau a v \tau a$, and that too. "Omes, nevertheless, may be connected with the Participle (like $\tilde{a}\mu a$, &c. N. 2), belonging, however, grammatically to the leading verb. E. g.

"Εκτορα καὶ μεμαῶτα μάχης σχήσεσθαι δίω. Il. IX, 655. 'Εποικτείρω δέ νιν δύστηνον έμπας, καίπερ ὅντα δυσμενῆ, although he is my enemy. Soph. Aj. 122. Οὐκ ἂν προδοίην, οὐδέ περ πράσσων κακῶς. Ευκ. Phoen. 1624. Γυναικὶ πείθου, μηδὲ τὰληθῆ κλύων. Id. Hipp. Fr. 443. Πείθου γυναιξὶ, καίπερ οὐ στέργων ὅμως. ΑΕSCH. Sept. 712. (Here ὅμως qualifies πείθου; although, as usual, it is joined with the Participle for emphasis.) 'Αδικείς ὅτι ἄνδρα ἡμῖν τὸν σπουδαιότατον διαφθείρεις γελῶν ἀναπείθων, καὶ ταῦτα οὕτω πολέμιον ὅντα τῷ γέλωτι. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. II, 2, 16.

(h.) In Homer, the two parts of καί . . περ are generally sepa-

rated by the Participle, or by some emphatic word connected with it. Kai is here very often omitted, so that $\pi \cdot \rho$ stands alone in the sense of although.

Both of these uses are found also in the Afric poets. E. g.

Τον μεν έπειτ' είασε, καὶ ἀχνύμενος περ ει ιίρου, κείσθαι. Π. VIII, 125. Καὶ κρατερός περ εων, μενέτω τριτάτη ενὶ μοίρη. Π. ΧV, 195. Τέτλαθι, μῆτερ εμὴ, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη τι ερ, μή σε φίλην περ εοῦσαν εν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδωμαι θεινομένην τότε δ' οῦ τι δυνήσομαι ἀχνύμενος περ χραισμεῖν. Π. Ι, 586.

Κάγω σ' ίκνοῦμαι, καὶ γυνή περ οὖσ' ὅμως. Eur. Orest. 680. Τάφον γὰρ αὐτὴ καὶ κατασκαφὰς έγω, γυνή περ οὖσα, τῷδε μηχανήσο-

µа. AESCH. Sept. 1037.

REMARK. Kalrot was very seldom used like $\kappa ai\pi\epsilon\rho$ with the Participle, its only regular use being with finite verbs. E. g.

Οὐδέ μοι ἐμμελέως τὸ Πιττάκειον νέμεται, καίτοι σοφοῦ παρὰ φωτὸς εἰρημένου. Simon. Fr. 5 (apud Plat. Prot. 339 C).

NOTE 6. The Participle $\delta \nu$ is sometimes omitted after the particles mentioned in the last three notes, leaving an adjective or a noun standing by itself. E. g.

Aὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν πολιτείαν οὐ παραδεξόμεθα, ἄτε τυραννίδος ὑμνητάς (80. ὅντας). Plat. Rep. VIII, 568 B. Αὐτὸ ἐπιτηδεύουσιν ὡς ἀναγκαῖον ἀλλὶ οὐχ ὡς ἀγαθὸν (80. ὄν), they practise it on the ground that it is necessary, and not on the ground that it is a good thing. Ib. II, 358 C. ⁷Η μὴν ἔτι Ζεὺς, καίπερ αὐθάδης φρενῶν, ἔσται ταπεινός. ΑΕSCH. Prom. 907.

NOTE 7. (a.) The Participle with any of the meanings included in § 109 may stand in relative or interrogative clauses. Such expressions can seldom be translated literally into English. E. g.

Τί δὲ καὶ δεδιότες σφόδρα οὖτως ἐπείγεσθε; what do you fear, that you are in such great haste? Xen. Hell. I, 7, 26. Τί αν εἰπών σέτις ὁρθῶς προσείποι; what could one call you, so as to give you the right name? Dem. Cor. 232, 20. Τῶν νόμων ἄπειροι γίγνονται καὶ τῶν λόγων, οἶς δεῖ χρώμενον ὁμιλεῖν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, which one must use in his intercourse with men. Plat. Gorg. 484 D.

(b.) Here belong τί μαθών; and τί παθών; both of which have the general force of wherefore? Τί μαθών τοῦτο ποιεῖ; however, usually signifies what put it into his head to do this? or with what idea does he do this? and τί παθών τοῦτο ποιεῖ; what has happened to him that he does this? E. g.

Τί τοῦτο μαθών προσέγραψεν; with what idea d'd he add this to the law? Dem. Lept. 495, 20. Τί παθοῦσαι, εἴπερ Νεφέλαι γ' εἰσὶν ἀληθῶς, θνηταῖς εἴξασι γυναιξίν; what has happened to them that they resemble mortal women? ARIST. Nub. 340.

These phrases may be used even in dependent sentences, τi becoming $\delta \tau i$, and the whole phrase meaning because. E. g.

Ti ἀξιός εἰμι παθεῖν ἡ ἀποτίσαι, ὅ τι μαθὼν ἐν τῷ βίφ οὐχ ἡσυχίαν ἡγον; what do I deserve to suffer, Էc. for not keeping quiet ? i. e. for the idea which came into my head, in consequence of which I did not keep quiet. Plat. Apol. 36 B. So Plat. Euthyd. 283 E, and 299 A. (See Matthiae, § 567.)

Note 8. Certain Participles, when they agree with the subject of a verb, have almost the force of adverbs. Such are $\mathring{a}\rho\chi \acute{o}\mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$, at first; $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \nu \tau \ddot{\omega} \nu$, finally; $\delta \iota a\lambda \iota \pi \acute{\omega} \nu$, after an interval; $\phi \acute{e}\rho \omega \nu$, hastily; $\mathring{a}\nu \acute{o}\sigma as$, quickly; $\lambda a\theta \acute{\omega} \nu$, secretly; $\kappa a\tau a\tau \epsilon \acute{\iota}\nu as$, earnestly; $\breve{e}\chi \omega \nu$, continually; $\phi \theta \acute{a}\sigma as$, quickly. (See Passow or Liddell and Scott, under $\mathring{a}\rho \chi \omega$, &c.)

 ${}^{\prime\prime}\mathbf{E}\chi\omega\nu$, ${}^{\prime\prime}\alpha\gamma\omega\nu$, ${}^{\prime\prime}\phi\epsilon\rho\omega\nu$, and ${}^{\prime}\lambda\alpha\beta\omega\nu$ may often be translated

with. (See example under § 109, 8.)

Note 9. $^{\sigma}\Omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ with the Participle generally belongs to an implied apodosis, to which the Participle forms the protasis (§ 109, 6). Here $\delta\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ means simply as, and the Participle is translated with an if prefixed. (See § 53, N. 3.) E. g.

"Ω σπ ερ ήδη σαφῶς εἰδότες, οὐκ ἐθέλετ' ἀκούειν, you are unwilling to hear, as if you already knew well (i. e. as you would be if you knew). Isoc. Pac. p. 160 C. § 9. (Here εἰδότες \rightleftharpoons ἐι ἤδειτε, § 52, 1.) 'λπήντων δλίγοι πρὸς πολλὰς μυριάδας, ιστερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίαις ψυχαίς μέλλοντες κινδυνεύειν, as if they had been about to risk the lives of others (i. e. ωσπερ ἀπήντων αν, εἰ ἔμελλον). Id. Pan. p. 58 B. § 86. So Ib. p. 78 C. § 179, ωσπερ πρὸς τὸν Δία τὴν χώραν νε μόμενος, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τὰς συνθήκας ποιούμενος, as (he would have done) if he had been dividing the country with Zeus, and not making a treaty with men.

That $\varpi \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ means simply as (not as if) is seen when a verb with ϵl follows; as in $\varpi \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ϵl $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \sigma \iota s$, as if you should say. See also II. II, 780, $\iota \sigma \sigma \iota \sigma$, ιs $\epsilon \iota$ ιs ιs

§ 110. 1. If a Participle, denoting any of the relations included in § 109, belongs to a substantive which is not connected with the main construction of the sentence, both the substantive and the Participle are put in the genitive, called *absolute*. E. g.

Ταῦτ' ἐπράχθη Κόνωνος στρατηγοῦντος, these things were done when Conon was general. Isoc. Evag. p. 200 C. § 56. 'Αφίκετο δεῦρο τὸ πλοῖον, γνόντων τῶν Κεφαλλήνων, ἀντιπράττοντος τούτον, ... καταπλεῖν, the Cephallenians having determined to sail in, although this man opposed it. Dem. Zenoth. 836, 1. (For the tenses

of the Participles, see § 24.) `Αθηναίων δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο παθόντων, διπλασίαν ᾶν τὴν δύναμιν εἰκάζεσθαι (οἶμαι), i. e. if the Athenians should ever suffer, &c. ΤΗΥΟ. Ι, 10. (See § 52, 1.) "Όλης γὰρ τῆς πόλεως ἐπιτρεπομένης τῷ στρατηγῷ, μεγάλα τά τε ἀγαθὰ κατορθοῦντος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ κακὰ διαμαρτάνοντος εἰκὸς γίγνεσθαι. ΧΕΝ. Μεπ. ΙΙΙ, 1, 3.

NOTE 1. The Participle in the genitive absolute may be accompanied by all the particles mentioned in § 109, Notes 1-9, with the same force as in other constructions. It may also stand in the relative and interrogative sentences of § 109, N. 7. E. g.

Καὶ αὐτοῦ μεταξὺ ταῦτα λέγοντος ὁ Κλεινίας ἔτυχεν ἀποκρινάμενος, while he was saying this, &c. Plat. Euthyd. 275 Ε. Ἐκ δὲ τούτων εὐθὺς ἐκήρυττον ἑξείναι πάντας Θηβαίους, ὡς τῶν τυράννων τεθνεώτων, because (as they said) the tyrants were dead. ΧΕΝ Hell. V, 4, 9. (See § 109, N. 4.) ᾿Απελογήσατο ὅτι οὐχ ὡς τοῖς Ἑλλησι πολεμησόντων σφῶν εἶποι, that he said what he did, not because they intended to be at war with the Greeks. Id. An. V, 6, 3. So ὡς ἐπιβουλεύοντος Γισσαφέρνους ταῖς πόλεσι, on the ground that T was plotting; An. I, 1, 6. ʿΩς οὐ προσοίσοντος (sc. ἐμοῦ) τὰς χείρας, . . δίδασκε, since (as you may feel sure) I will not lay hands on you, teach me. Id. Mem. II, 6, 32. Κῦρος δὲ ἀπορίησι ἐνείχετο, ἄτε χρόνου ἐγγινομένου συχνοῦ, inasmuch as a long time intervened. Hdt. I, 190. (See § 109, N. 3.) Ἦγγὰρ ἀδύνατος, ὡστε σηπομένου τοῦ μηροῦ. Id. VI, 136. Οἱ Ἑλληνες οὕτως ἡγανάκτησαν, ὡσπερ δλης τῆς Ἑλλάδος πεπορθημένης, as if the whole of Greece had been devastated (i. e. as they would have been, if it had been devastated). Isoc. Helen. p. 217 D. § 49.

For the genitive absolute after is, in connection with verbs of

knowing, &c., see § 113, Note 10.

Note 2. A Participle sometimes stands alone in the genitive absolute, when a noun or pronoun can easily be supplied from the context, or when some general word (like ἀνθρώπων, πραγμάτων) is understood. E. g.

Οἱ δὲ πολέμιοι, προσιόντων, τέως μὲν ἡσύχαζον, but the enemy, as they (men before mentioned) came on, for a time kept quiet. ΧΕΝ. Απ. V, 4, 16. So ἐπαγομένων αὐτοὺς, ΤΗΠΟ. Ι, 3. Οὕτω δ' ἐχόντων, εἰκὸς, κ.τ.λ., and things being so (sc. πραγμάτων), &c. ΧΕΝ. Απ. ΗΙ, 2, 10. Οὐκ ἐξαιτούμενος, οὐκ ᾿Αμφικτυονικὰς δίκας ἐπαγόντων, οὐκ ἐπαγγελλομένων, οὐδαμῶς ἐγῶ προδέδωκα τὴν εἰς ὑαῖς εὔνοιαν. DΕΜ. Cor. 381, 30. (Here ἀνθρώπων is understood with ἐπαγόντων and ἐπαγγελλομένων.)

So when the Participle denotes a state of the weather; as νοντος πολλώ, when it was raining heavily. Xen. Hell. I, 1, 16. (In such cases the Participle is masculine, Διός being understood. See Arist.

Nub. 370, νοντα; and II. XII, 25, δε δ' ἄρα Ζεύς.)

NOTE 3. A passive Participle may stard in the genitive absolute

with a clause introduced by 571. If the subject of such a clause is plural, the Participle is itself sometimes plural, by a kind of attraction. E. g.

Σαφῶς δηλωθέντος ὅτι ἐν ταῖς ναυσὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὰ πράγματα ἐγένετο, it having been clearly shown, that, &c. ΤΗΠС. I, 74. In I, 116 we find ἐσαγγελθέντων ὅτι Φοίνισσαι νῆες ἐπ' αὐτοὺς πλέουσιν, it having been announced, that, &c.

NOTE 4. The Participle $\tilde{\omega}_{\nu}$ is rarely omitted, leaving a noun and an adjective alone in the genitive absolute. E. g.

'Ως έμοῦ μόνης πέλας (sc. ούσης). SOPH. O. C. 83.

Note 5. The genitive absolute is regularly used only when a new subject is introduced into the sentence (§ 110, 1), and not when the Participle can be joined with any substantive already belonging to the construction. Yet this rule is sometimes violated, in order to give greater prominence to a participial clause. E. g.

Διαβε βηκότος ήδη Περικλέους, ηγγέλθη αὐτῷ ὅτι Μέγαρα ἀφέοτηκε. ΤΗυς. Ι, 114.

2. The Participles of impersonal verbs stand in the accusative absolute, in the neuter singular, when other participles would stand in the genitive absolute. Such are δέον, ἐξόν, παρόν, προσῆκον, παρέχον, μέλον, μεταμέλον, δοκοῦν, δόξαν, and the like; also passive Participles used impersonally (as προσταχθέν, εἰρημένον); and such expressions as ἀδύνατον ὄν, it being impossible, composed of an adjective and ὄν. E. g.

Οἱ δ' οὐ βοηθήσαντες, δέον, ὑγιεῖς ἀπῆλθον; and did those who brought no aid when it was necessary escape safe and sound? Plat. Alcib. I, 115 B. 'Απλᾶς δὲ λύπας ἐξὸν (sc. φέρειν), οὐκ οἴσω διπλᾶς. Ευκ. Ιρh. Taur. 688. Παρέχον δὲ τῆς 'Ασίης πάσης ἄρχειν εὐπετέως, ἄλλο τι αἰρήσεσθε; Hdt. V, 49. Εὖ δὲ παρασχὸν, απώ when an opportunity offers. Thuc. I, 120. Οὐ προσῆκον, improperly. Id. IV, 95. Συνδόξαν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῆ μητρὶ, γαμεί τὴν Κυαξάρου θυγατέρα. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. VIII, 5, 28. Εἰρημένον κύσιον εἶναι ὅ τι ἀν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ξυμμάχων ψηφίσηται. Τhuc. V, 30. Sο εδογμένον, I, 125; γεγραμμένον, V, 56; από προστεταγμένον, P. LAT. Leg. X, 902 D. Καὶ ἐνθένδε πάλιν, προσταχ θ ἐν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου Μένωνα ἄγειν εἰς 'Ελλήσποντον, ἀχόμην. DEM. Polycl. 1210, 5. Παρκελεύοντό τε, ἀδύνατον δν ἐν νυκτὶ ἄλλω τω σημῆναι. Thuc. VII, 44. "Εγωγ', ἔφη ὁ Κῦρος, οἶμαι, ἄμα μὲν συναγορενόντων ἡμῶν, Δμα δὲ καὶ αἰσχρὸν δν τὸ ἀντιλέγειν, κ.τ.λ. ΧΕΝ. Cyr. II, 2, 20. (The genitive belongs under § 110, 1. See § 111) 'Αντιπαρεσκενάζετο ἐρρωμένως, ὡς μάχης ἔτι δεῆσον, on the ground that there

would still he need of a battle. Ib. VI, 1, 26. (See Remark, below.) Oi δὲ τριάκοντα, ὡς ἐξὸν ήδη αὐτοῖς τυραννεῖν ἀδεῶς, προείπον, κ.τ.λ., i. e. thinking that it was now in their power, &c. Id. Hell. II, 4, 1. "Η γὰρ νοεῖς θάπτειν σφ', ἀπόρρητον πόλει (sc. ὄν), when it is forbidden to the city. Soph. Ant. 44.

REMARK. The accusative absolute may take the same particles as the genitive absolute (§ 110, 1, Note 1). It may also omit the Participle öv. (See the last two examples, above.)

NOTE 1. Even the Participles of personal verbs sometimes stand with their nouns in the accusative absolute, in all genders and numbers, if they are preceded by $\dot{\omega}_{S}$ (used as in § 109, Note 4), or by $\ddot{\omega}_{\sigma}\pi\epsilon\rho$, as if. E. g.

NOTE 2. The accusative absolute used personally without $\dot{\omega}_S$ or $\dot{\omega}_{\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho}$ is very rare. It occurs chiefly with the neuter of Participles which are regularly impersonal. E. g.

Προσῆκον αὐτῷ τοῦ κλήρου μέρος ὅσονπερ ἐμοί. ISAE. V, § 12. Ταῦτα δὲ γινόμενα, πένθεα μεγάλα τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους καταλαμβάνει. ΗDT. II, 66. Ἦδη ἀμφοτέροις μὲν δοκοῦν ἀναχωρεῖν, κυρωθὲν δὲ οὐ δὲν, νυκτός τε ἐπιγενομένης, οἱ μὲν Μακεδόνες. .. ἐχώρουν ἐπ' οἴκουΤΗυC. IV, 125. Δόξαντα δὲ ταῦτα καὶ περανθέντα, τὰ στρατεύματα ἀπὴλθε. ΧΕΝ. Hell. III, 2, 19. Δόξαν ἡμῖν ταῦτα occurs in Plat. Prot. 314 C, where we may supply ποιεῖν.

\$ 111. As the Participle in the genitive (or accusative) absolute denotes the same relations (time, cause, &c.) as the Participle in its ordinary construction (§ 109), both may be used in the same sentence, and be connected by conjunctions. When several Participles denoting these relations occur in any sentence, those which belong to substantives already connected with the main construction agree with those substantives in case, while those which refer to some new subject stand with that subject in the genitive absolute; any which are impersonal standing in the accusative absolute. E. g.

Οἱ μὲν Ελληνες στραφέντες παρεσκευάζοντο ὡς ταύτη προσιόντος 10 * (sc. τοῦ βασιλέως) καὶ δεξόμενοι, they prepared themselves with a view to his (the King's) coming up and to receiving him. XEN. An. I, 10, 6. Τῆς γὰρ ἐμπορίας οὐκ οὔσης, οὐδ' ἐπιμιγνύντες ἀδεῶς ἀλλήλοις, ... νεμόμενοί τε τὰ ἐαυτῶν, ... ἀδηλὸν δν ὁπότε τις ἐπελθῶν καὶ ἀτειχίστων ἄμα ὅντων ἄλλος ἀφαιρήσεται, τῆς τε καθ ἡμέραν ἀναγκαίου τροφῆς πανταχοῦ ἀν ἡγούμενοι ἐπικρατεῖν, οὐ χαλεπῶς ἀπανίσταντο. ΤΗυς. Ι, 2. Καὶ πάντα διαπραξάμενος ἐν τῆ ἐκκλησία (Κλέων), καὶ ψηφισαμένων 'Αθηναίων αὐτῷ τὸν πλοῦν, τῶν τε ἐν Πύλω στρατηγῶν ἔνα προσελόμενος, τὴν ἀναγωγήν διὰ τάχους ἐποιεῖτο. Id. IV, 29. 'Αλκιβιάδης τοῖς Πελοποννησίοις ὕποπτος ὧν, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀφικομένης ἐπιστολῆς ὥστ' ἀποκτείναι, ὑποχωρεί παρὰ Τισταφέρνην. Id. VIII, 45.

See the examples collected by Krüger, Vol. I, § 56, 14, 2; and

his note to THUC. IV, 5, 1.

§ 112. The Participle may be joined with certain verbs to restrict their meaning to particular actions, in a sense which often resembles that of the Infinitive (§ 92, 1). Such a Participle may agree in case with either the subject or the object of the verb.

1. The Participle is thus used especially with verbs signifying to begin, to continue, to endure, to persevere, to cease (or cause to cease), to repent, to be weary of, to be pleased, displeased, or ashamed, to represent (as in a poem), to find.

Further, after verbs signifying to overlook or to allow (περισράω, ἐφοράω, with περιείδον and ἐπείδον, sometimes είδον) the Participle is used in the sense of the object Infinitive, the Present and Aorist Participles differing merely as the same tenses of the Infinitive would differ in similar constructions (§ 15, 1; § 23, 1). See § 24, Note 2. E. g.

(a.) "Αρξομαι λέγων, I will begin to speak. Plat. Symp. 186 B. Παῦσαι λέγουσα, cease speaking. Eur. Hippol. 706. (So ἀπειπεῖν λέγων.) Οὐκ ἀνέξομαι ζῶσα, I shall not endure to live. Ib. 355. Τὴν ψιλοσοφίαν παῦσον ταῦτα λέγουσαν, cause philosophy to stop saying this. Plat. Gorg. 482 A. Καὶ ἐγὼ τοῖς ἐρωτῶσι χαίρω ἀποκρινόμενος, I like to answer, &c. Id. Prot. 318 D. Τῷ μέν ρα χαίρον νοστήσαντι, they rejoiced in his return. Od. XIX, 463. Τῆς λλολίδος χαλεπῶς ἔφερεν ἀπεστερημένος, he took it hardly that he was deprived of Aeolis. Χεν. Hell. III, 2, 13. Αἰσχύνομαι λέγων, I am ashamed to say. (For αἰσχύνομαι λέγειν, see below, N. 6.) 'Αποκάμνω τρέχων, I am weary of running. Τοὺς ἐκ τῆς νήσου δεσμώτας μετεμέλοντο ἀποδεδωκότες, they repented of having given them up. Τημο. V, 35. Πεποίηκε τοὺς ἐν "Αιδου τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον τιμωρουμένους, he has represented those in Hades as suffering

punishment. Plat. Gorg. 525 E. Εδρεν δ' εὐρύοπα Κρονίδην ἄτερ ημενον άλλων, she found him sitting apart. Π. I, 498. So I, 27.

(b.) Μὴ περιίδωμεν ὑβρισθεῖσαν τὴν Λακεδαίμονα καὶ καταφρονηθεῖσαν, let us not allow Lacedaemon to be insulted and despised. Isoc. Archid. 138 A. § 108. Μή μὶ ἰδεῖν θανόνθὶ ὑπ ἀστῶν, not w see me killed. Eur. Orest. 746. Τλῆναί σε δρῶσαν, that thou shouldst take courage to do. Soph. El. 943. See examples in § 24, N. 2.

REMARK. In Herodotus πειράομαι is often used with the Participle in the same way; as οὐκ ἐπειρᾶτο ἐπιῶν ὁ Κῦρος, Cyrus did not attempt to approach, I, 77. So I, 84; VI, 50.

'Αποδείκνυμι and παρασκευάζω, in the meaning to render, may take the Participle as well as the Infinitive; as in Xen. Cyr. I, 6, 18, ἄμα καὶ τὰπιτήδεια μάλιστα ἔχοντας ἀποδείξειν καὶ τὰ σώματα ἄριστα ἔχοντας παρασκευάσειν. So Arist. Plut. 210, βλέποντ' ἀποδείξω σε, I will make you see. See these two verbs in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon.

2. The Participle used with the following verbs contains the leading idea of the expression: $\delta\iota a\tau \epsilon \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, to continue, $\lambda a\nu \theta \dot{a}\nu \omega$, to escape the notice of, $\tau \nu \gamma \chi \dot{a}\nu \omega$, to happen, $\phi \theta \dot{a}\nu \omega$, to anticipate, to get the start of, of $\chi \circ \mu a\iota$, to be gone, and $\theta a\mu \iota - \zeta \omega$, to be wont or to be frequent.

So in poetry with $\kappa v \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, to happen; and in Herodotus with $\sigma v \mu \pi i \pi \tau \omega$, to happen, and with $\pi o \lambda \lambda \dot{o} s \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\mu} \iota$, $\pi o \lambda \lambda \dot{o} s \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa \epsilon \iota \mu a\iota$, or $\pi a \nu \tau c \dot{i} o s \gamma i \gamma \nu o \mu a\iota$, to be urgent; and in Homer with $\beta \dot{\eta}$ for $\ddot{\epsilon} \beta \eta$. E. g.

Διατελεῦσι τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ alel ἐόντες ἐλεύθεροι, they still remain free. Hdt. VII, 111. "Οσην εύνοιαν έχων έγω διατελώ, as much good will as I continually bear. Dem. Cor. § 1. "Ελαθεν (αὐτήν) άφθέντα πάντα καὶ καταφλεχθέντα, everything took fire and was consumed before she knew it. THUC. IV, 133. (See § 24, Note 1.) Φονέα τοῦ παιδὸς ἐλάνθαν ε βόσκων, he was unconsciously supporting the murderer of his son. HDT. I, 44. (See Rem. below.) *Ετυχον έν τ \hat{g} ἀγορ \hat{g} ὁπλίται καθεύδοντες, soldiers happened to be sleeping in the market-place. ΤΗυς. IV, 113. Κατά θέον γάρ τινα έτυχον καθήμενος ένταῦθα, I happened to be sitting there. PLAT. Euthyd. 272 Ε. Οί δ' οὐκ ἔφθασαν πυθόμενοι τὸν πόλεμον, καὶ ... ἦκον, they no sooner heard of the war than they came, &c. Isoc. Paneg. 58 Β. § 86. "Εφθησαν πολλώ οι Σκύθαι τους Πέρο ας έπι την γέφυραν άπικόμενοι, the Scythians came to the bridge much before the Persians. Η DT. IV, 136. Αὐτοὶ φθήσονται τοῦτο δράσαντες, they will be the first to do this for themselves. Plat. Rep. II, 375 C. (See § 24, N. 1.) Φθάνουσι ἐπ' αὐτὰ καταφεύγοντες, they are the first to run to them Aeschin. Cor. § 248. Οἴχεται φεύγων, he has taken flight. Πρεεβεύων ώχετο, he was gone on an embassy. XEN.

Cyr. V, 1, 3. Οῦ τι κομιζόμενός γε θάμιζεν, he had not been used to being thus cared for. Od. VIII, 451. Οὐ θαμίζεις καταβαίνωι εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ, you do not come down very often. Plat. Rep. I, 328 C.

Τοῦτον οἰσθ' εἰ ζῶν κυρεῖ; dost thou know whether he is perchance living? Soft. Phil. 444. Πολλὸς ἦν λισσόμενος ὁ ξεῖνος, the stranger entreated urgently. Hdt. IX, 91. Γέλων δὲ πολλὸς ἐνέκειτο λέγων τοιάδε, and Gelon spoke urgently as follows. Id. VII, 158. Τότε παντοῖοι ἐγένοντο Σκύθαι δεόμενοι τῶν Ἰώνων λῦσαιτὸν πόρον, they begged them in every way (lit. they took every form in begging them). Id. VII, 10. Συνεπεπτώκεε ἔρις ἐοῦσα, there had happened to be a quarrel. Id. I, 82. Βῆ φεύγων, he took flight. II. II, 665. (See § 97, N. 1.)

REMARK. $\Lambda av\theta \acute{a}\nu \omega$ being an active verb, meaning to escape the notice of, must have an object expressed or understood. When no object is expressed, sometimes $\pi \acute{a}\nu ras$ is understood, and sometimes a reflexive referring to the subject. Thus $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda a\theta \epsilon$ $\tau o \tilde{\nu} \tau o \pi o i \eta \sigma as$ may mean either he did this without any one's knowing it (sc. $\pi \acute{a}\nu ras$), or he did this unconsciously (sc. $\tilde{\epsilon}a\nu r\acute{o}\nu$).

NOTE 1. 'Αρκέω, to be sufficient, and ἰκανός, ἡδίων, κρείσσων, or βελτίων εἰμί are sometimes used in a personal construction with the Participle (like δῆλός εἰμι, &c., § 113, N. 1), where we should expect an impersonal construction with the Infinitive. E. g.

'Αρκέσω θνήσκουσ' έγώ, it will be enough for me to die. Soph. Ant. 547. (We should expect ἀρκέσει ἐμοὶ θνήσκειν.) Κρείσσων γὰρ ἦσθα μηκέτ' ὧν ἢ ζῶν τυφλός. Id. O. T. 1368. 'Ηδίους ἔσεσθε ἀκούσαντες. Dem. Aristoc. 641, 9.

Note 2. As $d\nu \epsilon \chi o \mu a \iota$, to endure, may govern either the accusative or the genitive, it may take a Participle in either case agreeing with the object. Thus we may say either $d\nu \epsilon \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota \tau \nu a$ $\lambda \epsilon \gamma o \nu \tau a$, or $d\nu \epsilon \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota \tau \nu a$ $\lambda \epsilon \gamma o \nu \tau a$, he endures any one's saying.

Note 3. The phrase où κ å ν ϕ θ á ν ois (or où κ å ν ϕ θ á ν ois (or où κ å ν ϕ θ á ν ois could not be too soon, is used with the Participle as an exhortation, meaning the sooner the better. The third person, où κ å ν ϕ θ á ν oi, is sometimes used, meaning, it might as well happen now as ever (for it must happen). See Passow.

NOTE 4. The Participle $\H{\omega}\nu$ is sometimes omitted in the constructions of § 112. E. g.

Εὶ δέ τι τυγχάνει ἀηδές (sc. δν.) PLAT. Gorg. 502 B.

NOTE 5. Λανθάνω is sometimes followed by ὅτι and a finite verb, as in XEN. Mem. III, 5, 24. When it is used impersonally, it regularly takes ὅτι.

NOTE 6. Some verbs of this class are followed by the Infinitive as well as by the Participle; generally, however, with some differ

ence in meaning. Thus alσχύνομαι λέγων means I am ashamed to say (but do say); alσχύνομαι λέγειν means I am ashamed to say (and therefore do not say). So ἀποκάμνω τοῦτο ποιῶν, I am weary of doing this; but ἀποκάμνω τοῦτο ποιῶν, I cease to do this through weariness. (See Passow, or Liddell and Scott, under these words; and Passow under ἄρχομαι.) See περιιδεῖν τὴν γῆν τμηθῆναι, Thuc. II, 20; and περιιδεῖν αὐτὴν τμηθεῖσαν, II, 18; where it is difficult to detect any difference in meaning. See, however, Krüger's note on I, 35.

Note 7. The Aorist (seldom the Perfect) Participle may be joined with the subject of $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$, forming a periphrastic Perfect. This is especially common in Sophocles and Euripides. E. g.

Τὸν μὲν προτίσας, τὸν δ' ἀτιμάσας ἔχει. Soph. Ant. 22. So Eur. Med. 33 and 90. Πολλά χρήματα ἔχομεν ἀνηρπακότες. ΧΕΝ. An. I, 3, 14.

For a similar periphrasis to express the Future Perfect, see § 29, Note 4; and § 108, Note 6.

Note 8. The Participles $\beta ov \lambda \delta \mu \epsilon vos$, $\theta \epsilon \lambda \omega v$, $\eta \delta \delta \mu \epsilon vos$, $\pi \rho o\sigma \delta \epsilon \chi \delta \mu \epsilon vos$, and $\epsilon \lambda \pi \delta \mu \epsilon vos$ sometimes agree in case with a dative, which depends on $\epsilon i \mu i$ or on a verb signifying to come or to happen; the whole forming a periphrasis for the verb of the Participle. E. g.

"Εστιν αὐτῷ βουλόμενω, it is to him wishing it, i. e. he wishes it. Καὶ προσδεχομένω μοι τὰ τῆς ὀργῆς ὑμῶν ἐς ἐμὲ γεγένηται, i. e. I have been expecting the manifestations of your anger towards me. Thuc. II, 60.

§ 113. The Participle is used also with many verbs signifying to see, to perceive, to know, to hear or learn, to remember, to forget, to show, to appear, to prove, to acknowledge, and with $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$, to announce. The Participle here resembles the Infinitive in indirect discourse (§ 92, 2), each tense representing the corresponding tense of the Indicative or Optative.

The Participle may belong to either the *subject* or the *object* of these verbs, and agree with it in case. E. g.

Μέμνημαι τὐτὸν τοῦτο ποιήσαντα, I remember that he did this; μέμνημαι τοῦτο ποιήσας, I remember that I did this. (In the first case ἐποίησεν is represented; in the second, ἐποίησα.) Οἶδε τούτους εὖ πράξοντας, he knows that they will prosper; οἶδε αὐτὸς εὖ πράξων, he knows that he himself will prosper. Δ είξω τοῦτον ἐχθρὸν ὅντα, $\mathbf{1}$

shall prove that he is an enemy; δειχθήσεται οὖτος έχθρὸς ὧν, he will be proved to be an enemy.

For other examples see § 78, 2; where examples of the Participle

with av after these verbs may be found. See also § 41.

Note 1. The Participle is used in the same way with $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \delta s \epsilon l \mu \iota$ and $\phi a \nu \epsilon \rho \delta s \epsilon l \mu \iota$. E. g.

Δῆλός τ' ἢν ο ἰόμενος, κ.τ.λ., it was evident that he thought, &c. Xen. An. II, 5, 27. (This is equivalent to δῆλον ἦν ὅτι οἴοιτο. See § 112, N. 1.) See below, Note 7. 'Απικόμενοι μὲν Φανεροί εἰσι ἐς ἸΟασιν πόλιν, it is evident that they came to the city Oasis. HDT. III, 26. So with Φανερον ποιέω: as Φανερον πᾶσιν ἐποίησαν οὐκ ἰδία πολεμοῦντες, they made it evident to all that they were not fighting for themselves. Υυσης. Leocr. p. 154, § 50.

Note 3. If the Participle of an *impersonal* verb is used in this construction, it must stand in the neuter singular (of course without a noun). The following example includes this and also the ordinary construction:—

Πειράσομαι δείξαι καὶ μετὸν τῆς πόλεως ἡμῖν καὶ πεπονθότα ἐμαυτὸν οὐχὶ προσήκοντα, I shall try to show not only that we have rights in the city, but also that I have suffered, &c. Dem. Eubul. 1299 4. (The direct discourse is μέτεστιτῆς πόλεως ἡμῖν, καὶ πέπονθα αὐτός.) See § 111.

NOTE 4. Some verbs which regularly take the Infinitive in indirect discourse (§ 92, 2) occasionally take the Participle. E. g.

Nóμιζε ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν ἀποκτείνων, think that you are putting to death a good man. Xen. An. VI, 6, 24.

Note 5. The Participle $\delta \nu$ may be omitted here, as well as after the verbs of § 112.

NOTE 6. When σύνοιδα and συγγιγνώσκω are followed by a dative of the reflexive pronoun referring to the subject of the verb, the Participle can stand either in the dative agreeing with the reflexive, or in the nominative agreeing with the subject; as σύνοιδα ἐμαυτῷ ἡδικημένος (or ἡδικημένος), I am conscious (to myself) that I have been wronged.

NOTE 7. The verbs included in § 113 may also be followed by a clause with $\delta \tau \iota$, instead of the more regular Participle. When

δηλόν ἐστιν and φανερόν ἐστιν are used impersonally, they regularly take a clause with ὅτι. (See § 112, N. 5.)

Note 8. Most of these verbs are also found with the Infinitive. (See Passow, or Liddell and Scott.) But ofda takes the Infinitive only when it means to know how. Thus ofda $\tau o \hat{v} \tau o \tau o \iota \epsilon \hat{v} \nu$ means I know how to do this, but ofda $\tau o \hat{v} \tau o \iota \hat{\omega} \nu$ means I know that I am doing this.

Note 9. Verbs signifying to remember or to know may be followed by $\delta \tau_{\epsilon}$ (when) and the Indicative, if a particular occasion is referred to with emphasis. E. g.

El γὰρ μέμνησαι ὅτ' ἐγώ σοι ἀπεκρινάμην, for if you remember (the time) when I answered you, &c. Plat. Men. 79 D. Οἶσθ' ὅτε χρυσέοις ἐφάνη σὺν ὅπλοις. Ευκ. Hec. 112.

Note 10. (a.) 'Qs is sometimes prefixed to the Participle in connection with the verbs of § 113. It implies that the Participle expresses the idea of the subject of the leading verb, or that of some other person prominently mentioned in the sentence. (See § 109, N. 4.) When this is also implied by the context (as it usually is in such sentences), the &s merely adds emphasis to the expression. Thus "obt raira outros exoura means know that this is so; but "obt is raira outros exoura means know that you may assume this to be so. E. g.

'Ως μηδὲν εἰδότ' ἴσθι μ' ὧν ἀνιστορεῖς, understand (that you must look upon) me as knowing nothing of what you seek. Soph. Phil. 253. 'Ως μηκέτ' ὅντα κεῖνον ἐν φάει νόει, think of him as no longer living. Ib. 415. 'Ως ταῦτ' ἐπίστω δρώμεν', οὐ μέλλοντ' ἔτι, understand that you may assume these things to be going on, &c. Ib. 567. Ως μὴ μπολήσων ἴσθιτὴν ἐμὴν φρένα, be assured that you will not buy me off from my determination. Soph. Ant. 1063. Δηλοῖς δ' ὧς τι σημανῶν νέον, you show that you have something new in your mind to disclose. Ib. 242. Δῆλος ῆν Κῦρος ὡς σπεύδων, it was evident (by the conduct of Cyrus) that Cyrus was in haste. Xen. An. I, 5, 9. Πατέρα τὸν σὸν ἀγγελῶν ὡς οὐκ ἔτ' ὄντα, (he comes) to announce that your father is no more. Soph. O. T. 956. (In vs. 959, the messenger himself says εὖ ἴσθ' ἐκεῖνον θανάσιμον βεβή κοτα.)

The force of ωs here can seldom be expressed in English.

(b.) The Participle thus joined with $\dot{\omega}_s$ may stand with its substantive in the genitive or accusative absolute. This sometimes happens even when the substantive would naturally be the object of the verb of *knowing*, &c., so that if the $\dot{\omega}_s$ were omitted, the accusative would be used (as in a). E. g.

'Ωs δδ' ἐχόντων τῶνδ' ἐπίστασθαί σε χρή, you must understand that this is so. Soph. Aj. 281. Here the genitive absolute has at first the appearance of a dependent clause; but ὡs does not mean that, and the literal translation would be, this being so (as you may assume), you must understand it to be so. (See Schneidewin's note

on the passage.) 'Ως τοίνυν ὅντων τῶνδέ σοι μαθεῖν πάρα, since this is so, you may learn it, i. e. you may learn that this is so. Aesch. Prom. 760. 'Ως πολέμου ὅντος παρ' ὑμῶν ἀπαγγελῶ; shall I announce from you that there is war? lit. assuming that there is war shall I announce it from you? Xen. An. II, 21. 'Ως πάνυ μο δοκοῦν,...οὕτως ἵαθι, know that I think so very decidedly, lit. since (as you must understand) this seems good to me, be sure of it. Id. Mem. IV, 2, 30.

(c.) We sometime find the Participle with $\dot{\omega}s$ even after verbs and expressions which do not regularly take the Participle by § 113. E. g.

'Ωs ἐμοῦ οὖν ἰόντος ὅπη ἀν καὶ ὑμεῖς, οὕτω τὴν γνώμην ἔχετε, be of this opinion, that I shall go, &c. Xen. An. I, 3, 6. So Thuc. VII, 15. 'Όταν ὡς πετόμενοι ἐν τῷ ὕπνῷ διανοῷνται, when in their sleep they fancy themselves flying Plat. Theaet. 158 B. 'Ως τοίνυν μῷ ἀκουσομένων, οὕτως διανοεῖσθε, make up your minds then that we shall not hear, lit. since then (as you must know) we shall not hear, so make up your minds. Plat Rop. I, 327 C. 'Ως στρατηγήσοντα ἐμὲ μηδεὶς λεγέτω, let no one speak of me as likely to be the general. Xen. An. I, 3, 15. Οὕτω σκοπώμεν, ὡς τάχ ἀν, εἰ τύχοι, καὶ τούτων κἀκείνων συμβάντων, let us look at the case, assuming that both this and that might perhaps happen if chance should have it so. Dem. Aristoc. 638, 25. (Literally, since (as we may assume) both this and that might perhaps happen if it should chance to b. so, le' us look at it in this light.) For ἄν, see § 41, 3.

REMARK. The examples included in Note 16 (b) and (c) holong properly under § 109, N. 4. (See also § 110, 1, N. 1; and the less example under § 110, 2, N. 1.)

CHAPTER VII.

VERBAL ADJECTIVES IN -Téos.

- § 114. The verbal in -τέος is used both in a personal and an impersonal construction.
- 1. In the *personal* construction the verbal is always *passive* in sense; expressing *necessity* (like the Latin Participle in *-dus*) and agreeing with its subject in case. E. g.

'Ωφελητέα σοι ή πόλις ἐστί, the city must be benefited by you. XEN. Mem. III, 6, 3. 'Aλλας (ναῦς) ἐκ τῶν ξυμμάχων μεταπεμπτέας εἶναι (ἔφη), he said that others must be sent for. Thuc. VI, 25. Οὐ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς ἀληθείας τιμητέος ἀνηρ, ἀλλ' ὁ λέγω ῥητέον. Plat. Rep. X, 595 C. So VIII, 561 C. Φράζοντες ὡς οὕ σφι περιοπτέη ἐστὶ ἡ Έλλὰς ἀπολλυμένη. Hdt. VII, 168.

NOTE. The substantive denoting the agent is here in the dative, as in the impersonal construction.

2. In the *impersonal* construction (which is the most common) the verbal stands in the neuter of the nominative singular (sometimes plural) with $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\iota}$ expressed or understood, and is regularly active in sense. The expression is equivalent to $\delta\epsilon\hat{\iota}$, it is necessary, with the Infinitive active or middle of the verb from which the verbal is derived.

Active verbals of this class may take an object in the same case which would follow their verbs. The agent is generally expressed by the dative, sometimes by the accusative. E. g.

Ταῦτα ἡμῶν (or ἡμῶς) ποιητέον ἐστί, we must do this, equivalent to ταῦτα ἡμῶς δεῖ ποιῆσαι. (See Rem. 2.) Οἰστέον τάδε, it is necessary to bear these things. Eur. Orest. 769. ᾿Απαλλακτέον αὐτοῦ (τοῦ σώματος), καὶ αὐτῆ τῆ ψυχῆ θεατέον αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα. Plat. Phaed. 66 Ε. (Δεῖ ἀπαλλάττεσθαι αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆ ψυχῆ

θεᾶσθαι τὰ πράγματα.) Φημὶ δὰ διγῆ βοηθητέον είναι τοῖς πράyμασιν ὑμίν, that you must give assistance in two ways. Dem. Ol. I, 14, 6. Τί αν αὐτῶ ποιητέον είη; what would he be obliged to do? XEN. Mem. I, 7, 2. Έψηφίσαντο πολεμητέα είναι (=δείν πολεμείν), they voted that they must go to war. Thuc. I, 88. Τὴν χώραν, ἐξ ἦs αὐτοῖς δρμωμενοις πολεμητέα ἦν. Id. VI, 50. Οὕτε μισθοφορητέον ἄλλους ή τοὺς στρατευομένους, οὕτε μεθεκτέον τῶν πρα-γματων πλείοσιν ή πεντακισχιλίοις. Id. VIII, 65. (Here both the accusative and the dative of the agent are found.) See Rem. 2. Ήμιν δε ξύμμαχοι άγαθοι, ούς ο ύ παραδοτέα τοις Άθηναίοις έστιν, ούδε δίκαις και λόγοις διακριτέα μή λόγω και (ήμας) αὐτούς βλαπτομένους, ἀλλὰ τιμωρητέα ἐν τάχει καὶ παντὶ σθένει (= οὖς οὐ δεί ήμας παραδούναι, κ.τ.λ.). Ιd. Ι, 86. Ἰτέον αν είη θεασομένους, it would be best for us to go and see her. XEN. Mem. III. 11. 1. ('Huâs is understood.) Οὐδενὶ τρόπω Φαμέν έκόντας άδικητέον είναι. PLAT. Crit. 49 A. 'Ατάρ οὐ γυναικών οὐδέποτ' ἔσθ' ἡττητέα ἡμίν (= οὐ γυναικῶν δεῖ ἡττᾶσθαι), but we must never be beaten by women. ARIST. Lys. 450. So SOPH. Ant. 678.

Note. A sentence sometimes begins with an impersonal verbal in $-\tau \acute{e}o\nu$ and is continued with an infinitive, the latter depending on $\delta \acute{e}\imath$ implied in the verbal. E. g.

Πανταχοῦ ποιητέον ἃ ἃν κελεύη ἡ πόλις καὶ ἡ πατρὶς, ἡ πείθειν αὐτήν. Plat. Crit. 51 B.

REMARK 1. The same impersonal construction is found in Latin, but very seldom with verbs which take an object accusative; as Eundum est tibi (ἰτέον ἐστί σοι). — Moriendum est omnibus, — Bello utendum est nobis (τῷ πολέμφ χρηστέον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν), we must employ war. See Madvig's Latin Grammar, § 421, a and b).

REMARK 2. The dative and the accusative of the agent are both allowed with the verbal in $-\tau \hat{\epsilon}o\nu$ (or $-\tau \hat{\epsilon}a$); although in the equivalent construction of $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\iota}$ with the Infinitive the accusative is the only form regularly used. Thus we can say $\tau o \hat{\nu} \tau o \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\iota} \nu$ mointéou or $\tau o \hat{\nu} \tau o \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s$ $\pi o i \eta \tau \hat{\epsilon} o \nu$, but only $\tau o \hat{\nu} \tau o \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s$ $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\iota}$ $\pi o i \hat{\tau} \hat{\iota} \hat{\nu}$.

APPENDIX.

I. On the Relations of the Greek Optative to the Subjunctive and the Indicative.*

FROM the time of the Alexandrian grammarians a special mood called the Optative (ἔγκλισις εὐκτική) has been recognized in Greek as distinct from the Subjunctive (ἔγκλισις ὑποτακτική). The ancient classification has been called in question in later times, and many grammarians of high authority have adopted or favored a union of the Subjunctive and Optative in one mood, to be called the Subjunctive or Conjunctive, in which the Subjunctive (commonly so called) is to supply the primary tenses, and the forms commonly assigned to the Optative the secondary tense. Thus the Present Optative would be called an Imperfect Subjunctive; ποιῶ and ποιοῦμι, for example, being supposed to bear the same relation

to each other as faciam and facerem in Latin.

This was first reduced to a systematic form by Kühner, who, indeed discards the common names Subjunctive and Optative (except as explanatory terms), and adopts the cumbrous expressions "Conjunctive of the primary tenses" and "Conjunctive of the secondary tenses." Rost, in his Griechische Grammaiik, § 118, says: "The so-called Optative is nothing but a peculiar form of the Subjunctive, and stands to the Greek Subjunctive in the same relation as in other languages the Imperfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive to the Present and Perfect." Donaldson in his New Cratylus (p. 617, 2d ed.) says: "It has long been felt by scholars on syntactical grounds that, considered in their relations to each other and to the other moods, they [the Subjunctive and Optative] must be regarded as differing in tense only." Again (p. 618): "These moods have no right to a separate classification." Crosby, in his Grammar, § 591, says of this classification, that "it deserves the attention of the student, although it is questionable whether it is best to discard the old phraseology."

As the classification of Kühner has been introduced into many elementary grammars, so that many boys are now taught to call the tenses commonly known as the Present and Perfect Optative by the strange names of *Imperfect* and *Pluperfect Subjunctive*, the

^{*} Reprinted, with a few changes, from the Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences for Jan. 8, 1861: Vol. V. pp. 96 - 102.

question becomes not merely of theoretical, but eminantly of practical importance. In fact it meets every student, and more especially every teacher of Greek grammar, the moment he reaches the paradigm of the regular verb. If it were merely a question of convenience, therefore, it would be highly important to have it settled,

for the sake of uniformity.

The question What shall constitute a distinct mood in any langrage? must be settled to some extent arbitrarily. No precise rule will meet all cases; yet we may safely maintain that, when any series of verbal forms in which the chief tenses are represented exhibits a closer connection in form and use among its members than it bears as a whole to any corresponding series, it is entitled to the rank of an independent mood. That this is true of the Latin Subjunctive is clear; and it is equally clear that the Imperfect and Pluperfect of that mood have sufficiently strong bonds of connection with the Present and Perfect to prevent them from being marked off as a distinct mood. A merely superficial view of the relation of the Greek Subjunctive and Optative might lead us to the idea that the two combined would form a mood similar to the Latin Subjunctive, thus simplifying the Greek conjugation and introducing a new analogy with the Latin. But it is this fatal error of carrying the analogy between the Greek and Latin further than the connection of the two languages warrants, which has thrown this whole subject into confusion. When the Latin was looked upon as an offspring of the Greek, as the result of a union of the Aeolic dialect of Greece with barbarian languages in Italy, the presumption was decidedly in favor of such an analogy, and it would even have required strong proof to convince us of any radical difference in the modal systems of the two languages. But the more correct views now entertained of the origin of the Latin would rather lead us to believe that each language developed its syntax, and especially its modal system, in-The modal system of the parent language of the Indo-European group is of course hopelessly unknown; and yet the comparison of the Latin and Greek verb with the Sanskrit (as the oldest representative of the family) sometimes enables us to determine special points in regard to the primitive forms with an approach to certainty. Thus, to take the simplest case, when we find asti in Sanskrit meaning is, we may be sure that some similar form existed with that meaning in the parent language of the Sanskrit, the Greek, the Latin, the German, &c., from which cori, est, ist, &c. were derived. So when we find a Potential mood in Sanskrit, which presents striking analogies both to the Greek Optative and to the Latin Subjunctive, and furthermore find the analogy extending even to the Gothic, we must conclude that the primitive language contained the elements which the Greek developed into its Optative, and the Latin into its Subjunctive. (See Bopp's Vergleichende Grammatik, II. pp. 257-259.) Again, the absence in later Sanskrit of any form corresponding to the Greek Subjunctive might lead us to think that the Greek developed that mood by APPENDIX 237

itself; but in the Vedic dialect a few relics are found of a true Subjunctive, with a long connecting vowel as its characteristic; for example, patāti, bearing the same relation to the Present Indicative patāti as βουληται to βουλεται. This seems to show that a similar mood existed in the parent language. If this testimony can be relied on, we must conclude, not only that the Latin and Greek derived the rudiments of their modal forms from a common ancestor, but that they inherited them from a period anterior to the separation of the Indian branch from the Indo-European family. We should therefore expect to find that the elements are generally the same in the two languages, but that the development is essentially different; and that the refinements in signification, for which the Greek modal forms are especially conspicuous, have been for the most part developed by each language within itself.

Let us now examine the forms themselves, to see how far a parallel can be drawn betweeen the Greek and Latin moods. In clauses expressing a purpose or object after $l\nu a$, $\delta\pi\omega s$, &c., we certainly find the Subjunctive and Optative used like primary and secondary tenses of the same mood: thus where in Latin we have manet ut hoc faciat, and manebat ut hoc faceret, we have μένει ίνα τοῦτο ποι η , and ἔμενεν ΐνα τοῦτο ποιοίη. But even in this case of strongest resemblance there is no place for the Future Optative, which corresponds to the Future Indicative. Again, in clauses expressing general suppositions after éav or el, or after relatives or temporal particles, depending on verbs which denote general truths or repeated actions, a correlation of the Subjunctive and Optative is found, analogous to that of the two divisions of the Latin Subjunctive; for example, in έαν τοῦτο ποιή θαυμάζουσιν, and εί τοῦτο ποιοίη έθαύμα(ον, which are sometimes represented in Latin by such forms as si hoc faciat mirantur, and si hoc faceret mirabantur, although generally the Indicative is preferred. Here, however, the analogy ceases, if we except certain cases of indirect question hereafter to be noticed, and a Homeric construction in relative sentences expressing a purpose, which almost disappears from the more cultivated language.

Let us turn now to the Optative in wishes; for here, if anywhere, we may look for the primary meaning of this mood. From this use it derives its name; and especially this is its only regular use in independent sentences, except in apodosis with $\tilde{a}\nu$. Here some have been so far misled by the supposed analogy of the Latin, as to translate the Present Optative by the Latin Imperfect Subjunctive; but a slight examination will show that the Present and Aorist Optative are here so far from being secondary tenses of the Subjunctive, that they are equivalent to the Present Subjunctive in Latin, and refer to the future, while the Greek Subjunctive cannot even regularly stand in such expressions. Thus $\epsilon lloe = ll$

In ordinary protasis and apodosis the same relation is seen four Greek forms, έὰν ποιῆ, ἐὰν ποιήση, εἰ ποιοίη, and εἰ νοιήσειε, find in the Latin Subjunctive only one equivalent, si facial. (For the first two the Latin generally preferred the Future or Future Perfect Indicative.) Here therefore the absurdity of classifying the last two as secondary forms of the first two, in conformity to a Latin analogy, is especially clear. What the Latin analogy would lead us to expect as secondary forms, the equivalents of si faceret and si fecisset, can be expressed in Greek only by the Indicative. In apodosis the Optative with av is equivalent to the primary, not to the secondary, tenses of the Latin Subjunctive; thus, ποιήσαιμι αν is equivalent to faciam (not to fecissem, which would be eroinga äv). Here likewise the Subjunctive cannot be used in Attic Greek. This analogy between the Optative and the primary tenses of the Latin Subjunctive might lead us even to the view that the latter ought rather to be called an Optative, for which view there are certainly much stronger reasons than for the opposite one which we are considering.

An Homeric exception to the principles of the last two paragraphs (explained in § 49, 2, Note 6, and § 82, Remark 2 of the present work) has little or no weight in this discussion; for, although we find examples in which the Optative in conditional sentences and wishes is used like the secondary tenses of the Latin Subjunctive, the ordinary use of the Optative referring to the future in those constructions is perfectly well established in the Homeric language. It would be a mere gratuitous assumption to maintain that the exceptions (like II. V, 311 and 388) represent the

original idiom of the language.

In indirect quotations and questions the Optative is used after past tenses, each tense of the Indicative or Subjunctive in the direct discourse being then changed to the corresponding tense of the Optative. Thus, είπεν ὅτι α δύναιτο ποιήσοι, he said that he would do what he could, implies that the direct discourse was a aν δύνωμαι ποιήσω, I shall do what I may be able. Here the first Optative is the correlative of the Subjunctive; but it is quite as often the correlative of the Indicative, as when we say είπεν ότι à δύναιτο ποιοίη, he said that he was doing what he could, where the direct discourse is å δύναμαι ποιώ. I am doing what I am able. One tense of the Optative, the Future, can never represent a Subjunctive, as that mood has no corresponding tense; but it always represents a Future Indicative. Nothing more need be said to show the absurdity of calling this tense a secondary tense of the Subjunctive. The three remaining tenses of the Optative can with no more propriety be called secondary tenses of the Subjunctive than of the Indicative, for they represent both on precisely the same principles. This is especially obvious in regard to the Aorist, which has two distinct meanings in indirect questions, — one when it represents an Aorist Indicative, and another when it represents an Aorist Subjunctive, the direct form. Thus, ηγνόει τί ποιή σειεν may mean either he knew not what he had done, or he knew not what he should do; as the direct question may have been either τί ἐπδίησα; what did I do? or τί ποιήσω; (Aor. Subj.), what shall I do? Strangely enough, this very class of sentences is supposed to furnish the most striking analogy between the Latin Subjunctive and the Greek Subjunctive and Optative combined. Non habet quo se vertat and non habebat quo se verteret are indeed equivalent to οὐκ ἔχει ὅπη τράπηται and οὐκ είχον ὅπη τράποιτο, but a single example like ἡρώτων αὐτὸν εἰ ἀναπλεύσειεν, I asked him whether he had set sail (Dem. in Polycl. p. 1223, 21), in which ἀναπλεύσειεν represents an Aorist Indicative αὐτόλενοσας;) shows that the argument proves too much. Indirect quotations and questions therefore afford us no more proof that the Optative is a secondary form of the Subjunctive, than that it is a

secondary form of the Indicative.

Two tenses of the Indicative, the Imperfect and Pluperfect, have no corresponding tenses in the Optative, so that these are regularly retained in the Indicative in indirect discourse; thus εἶπεν ὅτι ἐμάχοντο means he said that they had been fighting, i. e. he said ἐμάχοντο. A rare exception to the last principle shows conclusively the propriety of the names commonly given to the tenses of the Optative. The want of a tense in the Optative to represent the Imperfect Indicative in examples like the last was naturally felt as a defect; and in the Infinitive and the Participle this want was supplied by using the Present in a new sense to represent the Imperfect, the peculiar use being always denoted by something in the context. In a few instances we find the Present Optative used in the same way to supply the want of an Imperfect, the context making it clear that the tense is not used in its ordinary sense. Such an instance is found in Dem. Onet. I, 869, 12; ἀπεκρίναντο ὅτι οὐδεὶς μάρτυς παρείη, κομίζοιτο δε λαμβάνων καθ' όποσονοῦν δέοιτο "Αφοβος παρ' αὐτῶν, they replied that no witness had been present, but that Aphobus had received the money from them, taking it in such sums as he happened to want. Here παρείη represents παρήν, and κομίζοιτο represents exouicero, which would ordinarily be retained in such a sentence. See § 70, 2, Note 1 (b) of the present work. If now the name of Imperfect be given to the Present Optative in its ordinary use, (when it represents a Present of the direct discourse, and is merely translated by an Imperfect to suit the English idiom,) what shall we call this true Imperfect Optative, which really represents an Imperfect Indicative, and stands where an Imperfect Indicative is the regular form?

We see then that the Optative was used in the whole class of constructions known as oratio obliqua, or indirect discourse, as the correlative not merely of the Subjunctive, but also of the Indicative, and that it possessed the power of expressing in an oblique form every tense of both those moods in a manner of which the Latin presents hardly a trace. In fact, this use of the Greek Optative presents one of the most striking examples of the versatility and flexibility of the language, and of its wonderful adaptation to the expression

of the nicest shades of thought of which the human mind is capable. This single use of the mood seems sufficient in itself to prevent us from assigning to it the subordinate rank of a secondary form attached to the Subjunctive.

II. ON THE TIME DENOTED BY THE TENSES OF THE IN-FINITIVE WHEN THEY ARE PRECEDED BY THE ARTICLE AND HAVE A SUBJECT EXPRESSED.

THE able and instructive treatise of Madvig on the two uses of the Aorist Infinitive in Greek (in his Bemerkungen über einige Puncte der griechischen Wortfügungslehre, published as a supplement to his Syntax der griechischen Sprache) contains the earliest complete statement of the ordinary uses of that tense. The same principle, as far as it refers to indirect discourse, is clearly stated in Sophocles's Greek Grammar (published in the same year, 1847). But with these exceptions, no distinct statement had been made, either in elementary grammars or in more elaborate treatises, of the simple principle which distinguishes the use of the Aorist Infinitive in βούλεται έλθειν, he wishes to go, from that in φησίν έλθειν, he says that he went. According to Madvig, however, the use of the Aorist Infinitive as a past tense is not confined to indirect discourse, but extends also to cases in which the Infinitive "has a subject expressed and at the same time is preceded by the article." This principle was too hastily adopted, on Madvig's high authority, in the first edition of the present work; and, as there seemed no good ground for distinguishing the Aorist from the Present Infinitive in similar construction, the general principle was stated, that any tense of the Infinitive could retain its designation of time (as in indirect discourse) when it had at the same time the article and a subject. The same class of sentences which seemed to confirm Madvig's view of the Aorist furnished also examples of the Present, and the use of this tense as an Imperfect made an exception here almost impossible.

A more careful review of all the examples quoted by Madvig, and of all that I have met with in reading since adopting his principle, has convinced me that the Aorist Infinitive here presents no peculiarity, and that it differs from the Present only in the ordinary way, by referring to a single or momentary act rather than to a repeated or continued act. The single example quoted by Madvig in his Syntax (§ 172) to support his principle is Dem. F. L. p 360, 10, § 61: τὸ μηδεμίαν τῶν πόλεων ἀλῶναι πολιορκία μέγιστον έστι σημείον τοῦ διὰ τούτους πεισθέντας αὐτοὺς ταῦτα παθεῖν, the fact that no one of the cities was taken by siege is the greatest proof that they

Other cases in which the Aorist Infinitive might seem to retain its force as a past tense are satisfactorily explained by Madvig. On the whole, it would be difficult to establish an exception to the general principle, that the Aorist Infinitive is a past tense only in indirect discourse, when it represents an Aorist Indicative after

verbs of saying, thinking, &c.

INDEX TO THE EXAMPLES

ADDED IN THE THIRD AND FOURTH EDITIONS.

AESCHINES. In Ctes. § 10 168 § 114 207	Homer.	Repub. IV, 434 A 115 V, 450 A 168
ARISTOPHANES. Vesp. 109 54	IV, 167 . 138 V, 216 . 171	SOPHOCLES. Elect. 47
DEMOSTHENES. De Falsa Legatione. p. 391, 11. § 159 99	PLATO. Apol. 30 D 35 Gorg. 498 A . 214	Trachin. 984 . 171 Xenophon.
EURIPIDES. Alcest. 386 25	Protag. 310 A . 25 . 79 . 317 A . 208 . 317 D . 25	Mem. IV, 3, 1 . 78

ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES (1873).

Aeschines, in Ctes. § 60								Page 143
DEMOSTHENES, De Corona	, p.	255,	2, §	88				8
Herodorus, III, 31 .		•						144
Homer, Il. I, 22								190
Plato, Men. 72 C .								55
" Crit. 51 B								234
								143
THUCYDIDES, IV, 16 .		•				٠		148

INDEX TO THE EXAMPLES.

	Page	ì		Page		Page
Aeschines.		Prom. 165.		145	Appian.	
In Timarch.—		203		77	Bell. Civ. II, 91.	24
§ 99	25	248.		199	ARISTOPHANES	
§ 125	149	292		106	Acharn. 312	37
§ 127	135	832 .		181	816 .	209
De Falsa Legat.—		470		155	Aves, 36	209
§ 2	145	481.		145	54	179
§ 145 (153) .	149	697		148	120	115
§ 151 (160)	149	712 .		209	180	106
In Ctesiph.—		747		73	280	100
§ 2	99	760 .		232	448	209
§7	51	786		202	461	185
§ 69	137	824.	•	69		7, 93
§ 83	7	835		114	964	211
§ 90 · · ·	162	865 .	•	191	1187	179
§ 110	118	905		157	1850	20
§ 123	99	907.	157	, 221	1875	110
	120	918	•	202	1494	83
§ 177	185	980.	44 24	43	1508	69
§ 248	227	979	11, 51		1679	34
Aeschylus.		1004.	•	181	Eccles. 236 .	194
Agam 15	202	1049 1051.		175	297	79
37	105		•	175 184	495	68
160	135	Sept. 38 195 .		111	Equit. 112	82
253	198	250 ·	977		696	25
340	62	253 .	. 91	187 209	698	105
584	188	429	•	33	Lysistr. 450 .	234
620	106	462 .		23	511	47
857	5	712	•	220	Nubes, 5	63
944 . 92	, 93	720 .		86	63	7
1041	35	754	•	35	116 51,	118
	211	790 .		86	125	6
	195	1037	. •	221	229	112
	202	1048 .	•	211	268	209
	128	1057		184		187
Choeph. 246	178	Suppl. 499.	• . •	45	340	221
	106	* *		10	367	185
Eum. 298	52	Andoc		1	370	223
573	69	Myst. I, 6, 38.	. § 43	68	439	126
	201	ANTIP	HOM		493	83
	181	De Caed.		i	505	186
	184				520	174
Prom 10.	69	p. 131, 36. §		126	535	156
152	72	133, 40. § 8	57 .	7	613	181

Nubes, 722			
792. 110	Nubes, 722 208	I.p. 15, 28. § 23. 198	
819	792 110	16, 3, § 23 . 188	114, 20. § 15 17
904. 110 II. p. 20, 12. & 8 . 159	819 210		122, 21, § 45 217
1130			123, 1, 6 46 183
1141			123, 16, 6 48 60
1161			
1250 129		21 1 6 10 45	
1255			
1277. 22 23, 14. § 18 47 128, 22. § 69 27, 130 1353 1352 37 1353 1353 1352 37 1353 1353 1352 37 1353 1353 1352 37 1426 23 1438 112 24, 12. § 22 196 129, 14. § 71 112 1436 21, 43 225, 19. § 26 140 1466 68 1179 130 1179 130 1179 130 1179 130 1179 130 1179 130 1179 130 146			
1383 . 111 1426 . 23 1438 . 112 1438 . 21, 43 141. 179 . 130 141. 179 . 1		21, 20, 9 12 10, 100	
1383 . 111 1426 . 23 1438 . 112 1438 . 21, 43 141. 179 . 130 141. 179 . 1		20, 14. 9 10 41	
1383 . 111 1426 . 23 1438 . 112 1438 . 21, 43 141. 179 . 130 141. 179 . 1		28, 27. 9 20 . 189	120, 20. 9 09 00
1426. 23		28, 29. 9 20 194	129, 14. 9 71 112
1438 . 112 25, 2. \$24 . 120 De Corona. 1436 . 21, 48 25, 19, \$26 141 1466 . 68 Pac. 430 . 194 III. p. 28, 5. \$1. 197 1179 . 130 Plut. 210 . 227 603 . 184 1027 . 44 Ran. 1 . 182 68 . 191 34, 17, \$21 . 15 96 & 98 . 139 23, 16, \$14 . 111 298 . 186 34, 17, \$21 . 15 298 . 186 508, \$609 . 35, 185 524 . 186 508, \$609 . 35, 185 524 . 186 509 . 35, 185 524 . 186 509 . 35, 185 5524 . 186 509 . 35, 185 5524 . 186 509 . 35, 185 5525 . 199 40, 18, \$2 . 23 8866 . 51, 103 40, 18, \$2 . 23 8871 178 40, 9, \$1 . 95 880 113 41, 18, \$5 . 95 880 113 44, 12, \$15 . 111 1120 . 68 177 244 42, \$7, \$21 . 128 1125 . 179 44, 30, \$18 . 107 1125 . 179 44, 30, \$18 . 107 1126 . 68 142 1177 1469 . 142 118, \$9, \$1 . 172 9, 17, \$2 . 80 10, 1, \$2 . 187 122 12 13, 16, \$15 . 140 13, 27, \$16 . 12 14, 6, \$17 . 234 70, 25, \$20 114 13, 27, \$16 . 12 14, 6, \$17 . 234 77, 25, \$20 62 14, 6, \$17 . 234 77, 24, \$37 14, \$2 . \$2 . \$2 14, \$6, \$17 . 234 77, \$2 . \$2 14, \$6, \$17 . \$2 . \$2 14, \$6, \$17 . \$2 . \$2 14, \$6, \$17 . \$2 . \$2 14, \$6, \$17 . \$2 . \$2 14, \$6, \$17 . \$2 . \$2 14, \$6, \$17 . \$2 . \$2 14, \$6, \$17 . \$2 . \$2 14, \$6, \$17 . \$2 . \$2 14, \$6, \$17 . \$2 . \$2 14, \$6, \$17 . \$2 . \$2 14, \$6, \$		24, 12. 9 22 . 196	180, 11. 9 75 184
1436			180, 14. 9 75 82
1436			De Corona.
1466	1436 21, 43	25, 19. § 26 141	
1179 . 130 Plut. 210 . 227 608 . 184 1027 . 44 Ran. 1 . 182 83 . 191 96 & 98 . 139 298 . 186 508, 509 . 35, 185 524 . 186 579 . 93 586 . 51, 103 695 . 199 441, 18, § 3 . 134 830 113 866 . 99 421, 1, § 6 . 10, 130 871 178 880 113 866		25, 24. § 26 . 188	
1179	Pac. 480 194	III. p. 28, 5. 6 1 . 197	
Plut. 210		29, 18, 68, 197	
608			
Ran. 1			234, 26. § 28 . 214
Ran. 1		81 11 6 10 181	
68			236, 19. § 38 . 28
96 & 98 . 139			236, 20. \ 33 . 31, 240
298			286, 28. § 34 . 111
## 402			240, 15, 6 43 . 118
508, 509			
524 · · · 186 579 · · · 93 586 · · 51, 103 695 · · 199 830 · · · 113 866 · · 99 871 · · · 178 955 · 177 1120 · · · 68 1125 · 179 1125 · 179 1126 · · · 68 1125 · 179 11378 · · 178 144, 12. \(\) 15 · 11 1149 · · · 117 1150 · · · 68 1144 · · · 136 1144 · · · 136 1144 · · · 136 1144 · · · 136 1144 · · · 136 1144 · · · 136 1144 · · · 117 1145 · · · 179 1151 · · · · 179 1151 · · · · · 179 1151 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			242, 10, 5 49 . 111
524 · · · 186		Philipp.	243 6 6 53 195
619		I. p. 40, 1. § 1 . 144	
686 . 51, 103		40, 9, 61 . 95	951 98 470 95
685 . 199	586 51 , 103	40, 18, 6 2 . 83	
880 113			201, 20. 9 90 . 210
866	830 113		
871			
955		49 19 6 11 110	268, 28. 9 124 . 188
1125		44 19 5 15 111	
1449		44 95 6 17 40	276, 1. 9 145 . 115
1449		44, 20. 0 17 . 49	276, 23. § 148. 163
1449		45,00.010. 101	284, 21. § 169 . 151
1449 • • 117 1449 • • 142 1459 • 1442 Thesm. 872 • 179 870 • 181 Veep. 283 • 154 397 • 185 Demosthenes. Olynth. I. p. 9, 3, § 1 • 172 9, 17, § 2 · 80 10, 1, § 2 · 80 10, 1, § 2 · 80 10, 1, § 2 · 80 10, 1, § 2 · 80 10, 1, § 2 · 80 10, 1, § 2 · 80 12, 22, § 12 · 12 13, 16, § 15 · 140 13, 25, § 15 · 191 13, 27, § 16 · 12 14, 6, § 17 · 234 15, 6, § 20 · 122 14, 6, § 17 · 234 15, 6, § 20 · 122 17, 4, § 20 185 1190 119 295, 18, § 190 119 296, 24, § 206 101 301, 28, § 206 101 301, 18, § 206 103 304, 1, § 228 111 318, 4, § 258 313, 6, § 258 381, 30, § 322 288 1190 1190 129 130, 24, § 206 1190 130 301, 28, § 206 1190 130 149 150, § 39 · 128 151, § 30 · 128 150, § 30 · 103 150, § 30		45, 27. 9 21 . 128	291, 27. § 190. 15
Thesm. 872 . 179 870 . 181 53, 4, \(\frac{54}{4} \) 184 54, 18. \(\frac{5}{4} \) 20. \(\frac{5}{2} \) 185 54, 20. \(\frac{5}{4} \) 50. \(\frac{5}{4}		47, 24. 9 27 . 135	291, 28. § 190 . 119
Thesm. 872 . 179 870 . 181 53, 4, \(\frac{54}{4} \) 184 54, 18. \(\frac{5}{4} \) 20. \(\frac{5}{2} \) 185 54, 20. \(\frac{5}{4} \) 50. \(\frac{5}{4}			295, 13. § 201. 31
S70			296, 24, \$ 206 . 117
Vesp. 288 . 154 54, 20, 5 50 . 103 302, 24, 223 . 117 54, 22, 5 50 . 44 54, 27, 5 51 . 131 313, 4, 258 . 58 55, 6 & 7, 5 51 . 126 318, 6, 5 258 . 87 126, 31, 5 10 . 127 127 128, 5 10 . 128 129		53, 4. 9 44 . 184	301, 28, 6 220 . 213
397 . 185 54, 22 . \$ 50 . 103 304, 1 . \$ 228 . 111 54, 22 . \$ 50 . 44 53 . 44 527 . \$ 68 . 12			802, 24, 6 223 , 117
DEMOSTHENES. Olynth. I. p. 9, 3, § 1 172 9, 17, § 2			
Demosthenes. Olynth. I. p. 9, 8, § 1 172 9, 17. § 2 80 10, 1. § 2 187 12, 2. § 10 23, 203 12, 22. § 12 12 13, 16. § 15 140 13, 25. § 16 191 13, 27. § 16 12 14, 6. § 17 234 15, 6. § 20 122 14, 6. § 17 234 15, 6. § 20 122 16, 6. § 20 122 17, 4. § 20 62 18, 25. § 20	897 185		
Olynth. I. p. 9, 3, § 1 172 9, 17, § 2 80 10, 1, § 2 137 112, 3, § 10 . 23, 203 12, 22, § 12 12 13, 16, § 15 140 13, 25, § 15	DEMOSTHENES.	54, 27. \ 51 . 131	
I. p. e, 8, \(\xi \) 1. \(\) 172 \\ \) 80 \\ 10, 17. \(\xi \) 2 \\ \) 80 \\ 10, 1. \(\xi \) 2 \\ \) 187 \\ 68, 12. \(\xi \) 18 \\ 12, 2. \(\xi \) 10 \\ 28, 208 \\ 12, 22. \(\xi \) 12 \\ 13, 16. \(\xi \) 15 \\ 140 \\ 18, 25. \(\xi \) 15 \\ 140 \\ 18, 25. \(\xi \) 16 \\ 12 \\ 13, 27. \(\xi \) 16 \\ 12 \\ 14, 6. \(\xi \) 17 \\ 234 \\ 15, 6. \(\xi \) 23 \\ 12, 25. \(\xi \) 20 \\ 14 \\ 24, 25. \(\xi \) 5 \\ 22 \\ 28 \\ 16, 6. \(\xi \) 17 \\ 234 \\ 16, 6. \(\xi \) 20 \\ 122 \\ 14, 6. \(\xi \) 17 \\ 234 \\ 16, 6. \(\xi \) 20 \\ 122 \\ 14, 6. \(\xi \) 17 \\ 234 \\ 16, 6. \(\xi \) 20 \\ 122 \\ 14, 6. \(\xi \) 17 \\ 234 \\ 16, 6. \(\xi \) 20 \\ 122 \\ 14, 6. \(\xi \) 17 \\ 234 \\ 24, 25. \(\xi \) 5 \\ 29 \\ 20 \\ 24 \\ 24, 25. \(\xi \) 5 \\ 20 \\ 24 \\ 24, 25. \(\xi \) 5 \\ 22 \\ 24, 25. \(\xi \) 6 \\ 22 \\ 24, 25. \(\xi \) 5 \\ 26 \\ 24, 27. \(\xi \) 14 \\ 24, 27. \(\xi \) 14 \\ 24, 27. \(\xi \) 14 \\ 24, 27. \(\xi \) 16 \\ 20 \\ 24 \\ 24, 27. \(\xi \) 16 \\ 24 \\ 24, 27. \(\xi \) 16 \\ 27, 26. \(\xi \) 29 \\ 24 \\ 24, 27. \(\xi \) 16 \\ 27, 26. \(\xi \) 29 \\ 27, 26. \(\xi \) 29 \\ 27, 26. \(\xi \) 29 \\ 28 \\ 28, 27. \(\xi \) 16 \\ 28 \\ 27, 26. \(\xi \) 29 \\ 28 \\ 28, 27. \(\xi \) 16 \\ 28 \\ 27, 26. \(\xi \) 29 \\ 28 \\ 28, 27. \(\xi \) 16 \\ 28 \\ 28 \\ 28, 27. \(\xi \) 16 \\ 28 \		55, 6 & 7. \ 51 126,	997 1 4 909 5
1. p. 9, 3, § 1	Olyntn.		201 20 1 200 000
9, 17, 9, 2	I. p. 9, 8, § 1 172	II, p. 66, 15, § 3 70, 140	001, 00. 9 022. 226
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	9, 17. § 2 . 80	67, 20, 6 8 189	De Falsa Legatione.
12, 3, § 10 23, 203 69, 6, § 13 13 341, 14, § 2 20 12, 22, § 12 12 70, 25, § 20 114 342, 2, § 3 20 13, 25, § 15 191 70, 25, § 20 14, 6, § 17 234 72, 25, § 20 63 342, 26, § 5 20 14, 6, § 17 234 72, 25, § 29 62 345, 14, 5 14, 5 17, 34 15, 6, § 20 122 74, 24, § 37 140 245, 27, § 16 20 42	10, 1. § 2 . 187	68, 12, 5 11 206	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		69, 6, 6 13 18	841, 14, 62 . 20
13, 27, 9, 16 12 71, 4, 5, 20 63 842, 28, 5, 6 22 14, 6, 5, 17 234 72, 25, 5, 29 62 845, 14, 51, 45 14, 51, 134 15, 6, 5, 20 122 74, 24, 5, 87 140 245, 27, 5, 16 20, 42		70, 25, 6 20 114	
13, 27, 9, 16 12 71, 4, 5, 20 63 842, 28, 5, 6 22 14, 6, 5, 17 234 72, 25, 5, 29 62 845, 14, 51, 45 14, 51, 134 15, 6, 5, 20 122 74, 24, 5, 87 140 245, 27, 5, 16 20, 42	13, 16. § 15. 140	70, 25, § 20)	842 10 4 9 90
13, 27, 9, 16 12 71, 4, 5, 20 63 842, 28, 5, 6 22 14, 6, 5, 17 234 72, 25, 5, 29 62 845, 14, 51, 45 14, 51, 134 15, 6, 5, 20 122 74, 24, 5, 87 140 245, 27, 5, 16 20, 42	18, 25, 6 15 . 191	10 71 12 { 15, 58	
14, 0. 9 17 • 234 72, 25. 9 29 62 845, 14. 6 14 51, 134 15, 6. 9 20 • 122 74, 24, 6 37 140 845, 27, 6 16 20 42	13, 27, 6 16 . 12	71. 4. 6 20 69	242 22 6 00
10, 0. 9 20 • 122 74, 24, 6 87 140 845, 27, 6 16 20 49		72 25 6 20 69	045 14 1 14 54 404
16, 22. § 22 . 154 HI. p. 110, 1 § 1 208 347, 26. § 21 22, 158	15, 6, 6 20 . 122	74 94 6 97 140	045 07 110 00 40
, ; , 202 and p. 110, 1 4 1 200 , 04/, 26, 9 21 22, 108	15, 22, 6 22	III n 110 1 4 1 000	947 96 191 99 42
	30, ; 101	208	021, 20. 9 21 22, 108

10	. 850, 8. § 29	134	De Rhodiis.	I, p. 828, 25, 26. § 49 29,
	851, 4. § 32 .	6	p. 197, 9. § 23 . 88	152
	351, 18. § 33 .	168	I	829, 28, § 52 . 104
	852, 26. § 37 .	158	De Megalopol. p. 202, 24, 64 . 52	830, 8. § 53 . 120
	853, 14 & 18. \ 89	158		881, 5. § 56 . 165
	853, 24. § 40 .	49		831, 10 - 12. § 56 59,
	854, 8. § 41 .	161	207, 5. § 19 . 75	62, 158
	855, 17. \ 45 .	79	In Leptinem.	833, 12-19. § 63 95
	855, 29, 6 47	197	p. 495, 20. § 127 . 221	884, 18. § 66 . 155
	855, 29. § 47 . 856, 10. § 48 .	158	496, 8. § 129 . 113 505, 9. § 157 . 74	834, 24, 25. § 67 104,
	856, 13. \ 48 .	157	505, 9. § 157 . 74	123
	857, 8. § 51 .	64		II, p. 837, 10. § 5 . 218
	860, 10. § 61 .	240	In Midiam.	837, 11. § 5 72
	864, 11 & 12. § 74	88,	p. 522, 18. § 24 . 196	839, 29. § 14. 218
	•	112		842, 9. § 20 176
	864. 18. 6 74 45.	158		842, 14, 15. § 21 49,
	864, 18. § 74 45, 864, 25. § 75 .	215		104
	3 69, 12 . § 88 .	183	530, 10. \ 49 . 214 535, 15. \ 64 . 126	842, 16. § 21. 126
	870, 22. § 94 .	79	536, 1. § 66 161	III, p. 846, 15. § 5 123
	872, 1. § 99 .	84	536, 25. § 69 . 123	849, 24. § 17 72
	878, 4. § 120 .	155	548, 17. \$ 104 . 151	852, 12. § 25 204
	878, 23. § 122 .	151	548, 20. § 104 . 161	In Onetorem I.
	379, 2. § 123 .	98	548, 20. § 104 . 161 548, 24. § 105 . 168 563, 26. § 151 . 77	f .
	379, 7. § 123 .	200	563, 26. § 151 . 77	p. 865, 24. § 7 . 163
		13,	582, 2. § 209 . 210	867, 1. § 10 . 20
	•	158	582, 15. § 211 . 181	869, 9 & 10. § 19 153,
	381, 5. § 129 .	17		164
		158	In Androtionem.	869, 12. § 20 153, 239
	887, 6. § 148	15	p. 593, 14. § 2 . 151	869, 18. \$ 20 . 50
	887, 17. § 149.	199	596, 17. § 11 . 72	870, 11. § 23 . 151 870, 27. § 25 . 161
	888, 4. § 150 .	14	598, 20. § 17 . 113	870, 27. § 25 . 161 873, 8. § 33 . 24
	888, 9. § 151 .	27	600, 5. § 22 . 137	873, 10. § 33 . 211
	888, 17. § 151 .	165	611, 10. § 59 . 151	•
	3 90, 5. § 156 .	64	613, 3. § 64 . 183	In Zenothemin.
	892, 13. § 163	202	In Aristocratem.	p. 886, 1. § 14 . 84, 222
	896, 30. § 177 24,	160	p. 623, 11. § 7 . 49, 78	
	402, 8. § 195	193	624, 20. § 12 . 162 627, 21. § 22 . 209	In Apaturium. p. 900, 22. § 25 . 199
	409, 25. § 221 . 410, 18. § 223 .	188	627, 21. § 22 . 209	903, 22. § 34 . 142
	410, 18, 9 228 .	199	629, 2. § 26 . 193	
	410, 28. § 223.	23	635, 15. § 48 . 127	In Phaenippum.
		197	638, 25. § 58 . 232	p. 1040, 20. § 5 . 40
	416, 7. § 240 182,		640, 10. § 62 . 74	In Olympiodorum.
	416, 11. § 240 . 419, 28. § 250 .	166 74	641, 9. § 64 . 228	p. 1172, 1. § 16 . 165
	424 6 6 280	86	659, 15. § 117 . 37	
	434, 6. § 289 . 439, 8. § 305 .	15	676, 12. \$ 167 . 202	In Timotheum.
	439, 29. § 309 .	141	683, 22. § 188 197	p. 1194, 13. § 35 . 165 1194, 20. § 35 58, 158
	441, 21. § 812.	59	688, 27. § 205 . 201	
		60	In Timocratem.	
	•	00	p. 702, 26. § 9 . 199	In Polyclem.
	De Pace.		711, 8. § 35 . 118	p. 1210, 5. § 12 . 224
Þ	62 , 10. § 20 199,	201	721, 6. § 64 . 22	1223, 20, 21. § 55 29,
-	De Chersoneso.		783, 20. § 106 . 75	151, 239
D.	90, 1. § 1	98	In Aristog. I.	1227, 2. § 67 . 165
F.	92, 21. § 11 .	198	p. 773, 1. § 11 . 87	De Coron. Trierarch.
	98, 25. § 85	205	In Aphobum.	p. 1228, 28. § 3 . 98
	99, 14. § 38	79	I, p. 813, 4. § 1 . 205	In Eubulidem.
	De Symmoriis.	• •	813, 20. § 2 205	
n	178, 17. § 2	44	814, 4. § 3 . 123	p. 1299, 4. § 1 . 280 1300, 8. § 3 . 58
ľ	182, 3. § 14.	225	828, 23. § 48 49	
	, 0. 3 .2	_20	200, 200, 9 20 20 1	1808, 2. § 14 150

p. 1803, 22. § 18 . 163	Iph. Aul. 462 . 38	I, 36 69
1000 05 610 07 100	1478 . 204	37 107
1808, 25. § 16 27, 128 1812, 17. § 44 20, 106		
1812, 17. § 44 20, 106	Iph. Taur. 688 . 224	
1819, 8. 9 65 . 34	995 . 86	42 43
1820, 25. § 70 . 105	1014 . 81	44 169
2020, 20. 9 10 . 100		44
DINARCHUS.		
	1208 179	44
In Demosth. p. 91, 24 72	Med.1 177	61 207
	33 229	63 6
EUCLID.		67 142
1,9 21	79 211	
1,5	90 229	68 7
EURIPIDES.	941 62	68 172
EURIFIDES.		69 7
Alcest. 11 199	1151 (1120) 186, 187	
52 106	1173 145	75 69
	1320 37	77 227
671 . 26, 108		82 228
755 11, 108	1 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
758 142	418 135	88 150
2 2 2 2	680 221	84 227
784 1 50	746 227	85 5
801 208		
1072 176	769 233	89 195
	770 80	94 193
Androm. 61 86	1132 119	99 69
888 . 179		
757 185	1529 81	116 29, 151
	Phoeniss. 92 . 84	129 193
929 . 106	504 217	136 145
Bacch. 343 156		
719 . 183	B95 . 184	153 208
	1590 . 185	165 81
Cycl. 131 179	1624 . 220	165 212
Elect. 126 175		
835 214	Suppl. 1066 185	171 131
	1084 . 119	187 94
484 56	Troad. 874 203	190 223
962 179	11044.014 200	
967 37		199 184
	Aeg. Frag. 5 104	209 202
1039 184	Alcmen. Frag. 103 194	II, 2 211
1061 176		
1124 88	Delier. 204 92	13 47, 131
	Ino, " 417 126	15 207
Hecub. 112 . 231	" 424 45	25 207
730 205		64 198
836 . 175	mippon 112 12	
839	" 443 220	66 225
	Frag. Incert. 1057 46	115 171
863 . 93		121 164
1042 183		
1056 . 182	HERODOTUS.	125 207
	T 4 040	135 141
1099 182	I, 1 210	143 142
1138 . 81	2 113	
Heracl. 248 85	8 219	146 219
451 . 179	9	150 131
		158 219
731 186	9 74	162 83
791 . 86	9 85	
Herc. Fur. 538 . 7	11 180	172 193
		TTT OO OOO
605 . 212	22 14	III, 26 230
746 . 33	24 210	36 74
1059 . 180	25 151	55 193
1417 . 183		
	80 14	62 185
Hippol. 846 . 190	81 29, 151	75 20
893 80	81 141	88 140
567 . 180	82 104	
		105 198
606 186	82 145	108 198
1807 219	82 209	115 170
1410 . 174	88 141	119 48
Ion. 1560 5	84 215	138 194

TIT 190	7 I, 60 .	107	II, 36	. 38
III, 139 1	83 61	98	43, 45	7
	48 66 .	115	80'	. 102
	35 81	. 109	106, 107	8
	97 82	. 121, 144	107, 108 .	203
	84 107	. 196	119 .	196
	27 118 .	68	127	208
	69 120	. 170	139 .	10, 128, 179
	06 128 .	. 102	182	204
	04 132	. 172	214 .	204
	24 135	114	236	. 179
	01 136	. 77	250 .	112
	00 137	57, 104, 151	252	. 77
12 1	95 139	. 55	259 .	174
23 2	118 150 .	183	290	. 190
	30 151	204	322 .	148
	159 .	217	831	. 178
	169 161	. 158	364 .	102
	227 168	. 133	881 .	67
	18 166	. 108	435 .	180
	212 174 .	. 56, 78	665	. 228
	223 178	92	780 .	222
	174 191	155	794.	. 168
	146 198	. 122	III, 28 .	38
	228 218 .	181	54	. 182
	138 281	. 172	110 .	76
	184 232 .	110	180	. 48
	146 242	. 128 . 172	192 .	178
	227 244		194 4	. 197
	140 255	. 105 . 196	281 .	102
	204 258 .	181	288	. 104
	228 262 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	112	291 .	. 143 155
		178	817	38
	155 322 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	57, 104, 182	366 .	177
220	81 338	203	428	139
285	121 844	71	459 .	
VIII, 22	19 858	98	IV 19	175
	199 863 .	180	176 .	55
	211 408	. 115	191	180
	199 432 .	25	284 .	128
	228 437, 439	. 7	238	156
	219 465 .	8	249 . 313 .	175
61	19 498	. 122	321 .	92
HESIOD.	498	. 227	835	168
	509	. 143	404	180
Op. 1	8 518 .	123	418	. 179
Homer.	522	68	482 .	133
Iliad.	524	. 68, 112	V. 66	. 19
	204 555	. 80	85 .	. 58, 101
	172 900 .	. 78	127	70
13	017 004	. 92	220	. 212
	174 000 .	114	228	. 22
	200 202	. 209	273 .	107
	181 000 .	221	298	81
	227 509 .	. 196	808	106
28	40 601 .	215	811	. 101
	146 II, 8 .	. 76	350 .	104
82	69 8 .	178	388	. 101
	171 10 .	. 209	407 .	133
			•	

V, 411 77	XIII, 172 210	I, 232 99
433 170		295 76
456 61		890 110
679 95		892 188
		Щ, 31
128 117		
146 137	667 32	54 184
164 175		59 204
177 169	XIV, 247 129	111 67
229 204	261 81	158 196
258 143	267 55	374 146
3 29 129	521 197	III, 19 78
850 177		129 76
861		205 174
448 123, 182	213 104	223
459	223 5	284 68
460 196		
521 129		859 69
VU, 28 105		IV, 97 177
303, 305 . 7	242 68	163 68
183 175	322 34,210	171 99
157 175	389 46	
179 209	XVII, 70 101	195 130
VIII, 32 170	177 45	363 . 95
36 67	272 202	477 146
125 221	XVIII, 86 177	
130 96	333 6	1
866 96	XLX, 59 177	668 210
452 210	813 210	733 63
IX, 42 207	423 210	735 75
121		V, 2 67
	XX, 26 104	57 142
	100 210	221 104
167 55	198 211	800 85
812 . 130, 181	257 211	828 132
820 45	801 68	885 168
897 128	XXI, 327 7	465 184
500 130	405 204	473 80
519 . 5	459 76	VI, 188 133
588 146	522 133	255 68
655 220	580 146	VII, 171 48
684 60		
702 128	XXII, 317 6	280 142
704 26	889 121	VIII, 20 69
X, 5-9 132	XXIII, 71 180	
100 81	274 102	147 130
111 175	526 101	844 78
222 118	658 - 656 . 7	852 107
487 197	805 85	451 228
	XXIV, 253 177	523-181 . 132
		579 70
XI, 20 204		IX, 876 168
67-71 183	751 47	420 76
404 184	Odyssey.	475 88
XII, 25 69, 223	I, 40 128	554
167 - 172 . 133	47 51, 129, 175	X, 175 . 145, 146
243 188	56 68	XI, 441 209
245 121		
332 139	1	
407	94 115	XII, 17 84
437 146		156 70
	205	295 170
XIII, 127 63	217 127	888 182

XIII, 209 8 214 133 215 180 365 76 376 77 XIV, 68 177 166 131 181 68 312 68 323 138 372 104 440 174 496 204 XV, 263 180 457 204 468 139	Archid. P. 116 A. § 1	p. 60 C. § 95
XVI, 24	Busir. p. 230 C. § 47 . 105 Demon. p. 2 B. § 2 19	p. 303 E. § 38 . 81 Trapezit. p. 360 C. § 11 . 214 361 D. § 15 . 169 361 E. § 16 . 167
XVII, 21 207 250 71 322 130 362 78 475 92	5 C. § 17 . 108 6 A. § 19 . 197 9 C. § 33 . 10 11 C. § 48 . 191 Evag.	363 B. § 22 . 40 Lycurgus. In Leocrat.
589	p. 193 D. § 24 . 11 200 C. § 56 . 17, 222 Helen. p. 217 D. § 49 . 223	Lysias.
402 210 XIX, 468 226 XX, 121 33 XXI, 194 182 201 175 XXII, 139 180 262 84	Nicocl.	In Agorat. p. 131, § 15 168 133, § 45 162 135, § 62
XXIII, 43 130 134 69 309 212 XXIV, 334 69	p. 160 C. § 9 222 162 D. § 18 . 103 163 A. § 20 . 26, 103 186 D. § 139 . 214	p. 145, § 8 117 De Arist. Bon.
Hymn. in Apoll. 1 182 ISAEUS.	Panathen. p. 241 D. § 44 . 216 254 A. § 103 . 141	p. 121, § 14 161 123, § 32 100 124, § 48 100
Cleon. § 26 5 Dicaeog. § 12 225 Menecl. § 10 39, 138 Philoct. § 35 40	44 A. § 16 . 146 44 C. § 19 . 145	127, § 74 . 163 127, § 76 167
Aeginet. p. 888 D. § 22 . 86 Antid.	49 B. 43 . 205 49 C. 44 . 139	Or. Funebr. p. 192, § 22 162 194, § 42 194 Or. X.
p. 70, § 115 196 199 . 199 . 119, § 270 208	57 C. § 83 . 113 58 B. § 86 . 222	

In Philocr.	Apol. 42 A .		191	Gorg. 479 A 63
	Charm. 156 A		160	479 A . 86
Fr 0000 8 00 0 0 00 1	163 A		84	479 C . 12, 206
182, § 13 . 37	164 B		187	481 A . 76
Menander.	171 E		127	482 A 226
Col. Fr. 6 46	Cratyl. 385 B		178	488 C . 189
Frag. Incert 41 . 19	396 C	•	144	484 D 221
Monos. 45	896 E		208	486 B . 52
387 197	401 D		21	487 D . 85, 74
397 37	430 E	•	83	489 C . 5
	436 B		88	499 C 208
Mimnermus.	436 B	•	87	500 C . 215
f , 2 51, 174	Crit. 43 B .	•	70	502 B 228
•	44 C .	•	98	503 A . 74
Nov. Testam.	44 D .	•	177	506 B 144
Matth. XI, 3 6	45 B .	•	52	506 C . 48
XXVI, 24 . 97	46 A .	•	22	515 B · · 74
Luc. IX, 40 78	46 B .	•	194	516 E . 94
Joh. XIII, 34 . 78	47 D .	•	8	516 E 112
PHILEMON.	48 C .	•	114	517 B . 208
	49 A .	•	234	522 E 86 523 E . 218
Frag. Incert. 29 46	49 B .	•	36	
PINDAR.	50 A .	•	159	
Ol. XI(X), 34 . 67	50 B .	•	171	Hipp. Maj. 301 A 20
	51 B .	•	217	
	51 E .	•	14	
XIV, 80 68 Pyth. VIII, 20 . 45	52 C .	•	14	Lach. 194 A 120 196 C . 83
IX, 196 . 211	52 D .	•	14	
Nem. VII, 25 . 45	52 D .	•	14	
VII, 68 . 56	Critias, 108 C	•	46	V, 736 B . 22 VI, 759 E . 209
Isthm. IV, 16 . 105	Euthydem.			X. 902 D . 224
	272 E .	•	227	
Plato.	275 E	•	161	XI, 917 E . 45 XII, 959 B . 73
Alcib. I, 115 B . 224	275 E .	•	223	Lys. 210 D 200
Apol. 17 C 181	276 E	•	161	214 E . 129
17 D 127	278 D .	•	21	215 B 126
18 C 116	283 C	•	75	215 B . 129
20 B 168			222	218 D 84
21 A 151	290 A	•	118	Men. 74 B 119
21 B 38	295 C .	•	146	79 D 231
21 B 151	296 D	•	174	89 B 78
21 C 151	296 E .	•	170	89 E 123
21 D . 124, 125	299 A		222	92 C 129
22 B 47	802 A . 802 B	•	129	Menex. 239 B . 196
25 B 88	302 D .	•	142 184	245 A . 142
25 B . 117	305 D	•	199	1
28 E 119		•	199	Phaed. 58 A 5
28 E . 203	Euthyphr.		e.	
29 A 189 29 C 56	4 E . 12 D	•	82	59 D . 29, 131 59 D . 144
29 C 207	13 D .	•	101 61	60 A 171
80 C 60	14 A	•	61	
82 D 95	14 A .	•	95	60 C . 85 62 C . 145
86 B 222	15 D	. A.	0, 50	63 A . 217
86 C 40	Gorg. 447 D .	* 4	101	66 E 238
87 B 42	450 D	. •	207	68 B . 105
87 C 187	457 E .	•	86	70 A 81
39 A 83	461 E	. •	218	71 C . 198
89 A 206	462 E .	•	88	72 C 51
40 B 219	476 D		189	
	2100	•	200	. 122 1 101

Phaed. 73 A	94 II, 360 B 140	X, 609 B 79
84 E .	84 860 C 64	614 A . 20
90 D	196 365 D 206	614 B 193
91 C .	82 868 B 80	615 D
91 C	112 872 E 183	620 D 111
95 D .	154 374 D 118	Soph. 242 A . 199
98 D	192 875 C 227	Symp. 173 B . 196
100 B	6 376 A 26, 28	174 D . 193
101 D	169 876 C 36	175 C. 15
102 D	217 879 B 184	186 B . 226
108 E	199 III, 393 E 40	188 A . 45
117 E	198 397 D 37	193 E . 49
Phaedr. 227 D	141 898 A 64	194 D . 189
228 A .	92 398 B 139	199 A . 69
228 E .	183 408 () 92	199 D . 101
228 E .	203 412 A 88	202 D . 62
229 A .	204 412 B 36	
230 A .	8 412 D 129	212 E . 87, 188
232 B .	47 415 B 78	213 D . 77
232 E .	146 415 C 32	215 A . 208
251 B .	199 415 E 194	Theaet. 142 A . 120
257 C .	81 416 C 188	143 E . 49
263 E .	183 IV, 427 E 43	
266 A .	145 427 E 200	145 A . 208
276 A .	194 430 A 40	145 B . 85
279 C .	174 433 B 206	149 C . 205
Phileb. 13 A.	82 433 E 76	155 A . 129
15 D .	183 439 B 64	158 B . 232
89 C		188 E . 8
63 A .	10 V, 451 A 82	209 E 31, 188
Politic. 264 A .	191 455 B 156	Theag. 123 B . 101
302 B .	196 457 C 180	Tim. 18 C 39
Protag. 313 A	101 473 D 103	18 E 40
	TTT 405 CI 000	81 B 18
		90 E 195
816 C .	100 0	
318 D .	400 13 404	Simonides.
320 A .	211 492 E 184	
828 B	45 495 E 197	Frag. 5 221
329 B .	107 501 C 143	
832 D .	26 502 A 21	Sophocles.
835 C .	173 508 C, D . 137	Aj. 20 5
835 D .	F1F T3 04	75 186
	207 515 E 64	122 220
889 C .	221 515 E 145	281 231
		1 201 201
D. D	522 A 8	
De Republica.	VIII. 549 B . 129	889 61
	VIII, 549 B . 129	889 61 403 183
I, 827 C	115 VIII, 549 B . 129 549 E 78	889 61 403 183 496 105
I, 327 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 549 E 78 232 553 A 21	889 61 403 183 496 105 536 25
I, 827 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 549 E 78 282 553 A 21 228 557 B 129	889 61 403 183 496 105 536 25 550 174
I, 827 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B	889 61 403 183 496 105 536 25 550 174 555 144
I, 327 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 232 553 A 21 228 557 B 129 220 561 C 233 167 561 E 21	889 61 403 183 496 105 536 25 550 174
I, 327 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 549 E 78 232	389 61 403 183 496 105 536 25 550 174 555 144 560 184
I, 327 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 549 E 78 528 553 A 21 228 557 B 129 220 561 C 233 167 561 E 21 163 564 C 74 78 556 B 194	389 . 61 403 . 183 496 . 105 536 . 25 550 . 174 555 . 144 560 . 184 567 . 78
I, 327 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 549 E 78 252 553 A 21 228 557 B 129 220 561 C	889 . 61 403 . 183 496 105 536 . 25 550 . 174 560 . 184 567 . 78 572 . 87
I, 327 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 232 553 A 21 228 557 B 129 220 561 C	389 61 403 183 496 105 536 25 550 174 555 144 560 184 567 78 572 37 674 45
I, 327 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 549 E 78 222	389 61 403 183 496 105 536 25 550 174 556 144 560 184 567 78 572 37 674 45 715 172
I, 327 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 232 553 A 21 228 557 B 129 220 561 C 233 167 561 E 21 163 564 C 74 78 556 B 194 78 567 A . 69 78 568 B 221 184 IX, 573 C 14	389 61 403 183 496 105 536 25 550 174 560 184 567 78 572 37 674 45 715 172 986 68
I, 327 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 232 553 A 21 228 557 B 129 220 561 C	389 61 403 183 496 105 536 25 550 174 556 144 560 184 567 78 572 37 674 45 715 172
I, 327 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 232 553 A 21 228 557 B 129 220 561 C 233 167 561 E 21 163 564 C 74 78 556 B 194 78 567 A . 69 78 568 B 221 184 IX, 573 C 14	389 61 403 183 496 105 536 25 550 174 560 184 567 78 572 37 674 45 715 172 986 68
I, 327 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 228	389 61 403 183 496 105 536 25 550 174 555 144 560 184 567 78 572 37 674 45 715 172 986 68 1082 46 1221 52
I, 327 C	522 A 8 VIII, 549 B 129 232 553 A 21 228 557 B 129 220 561 C	389 61 403 183 496 105 536 25 550 174 555 144 560 184 567 78 572 37 674 45 715 172 986 68 1082 46

				145
Aj. 1418	•		211	Oed. Col. 667 199 Phil. 961 . 145
Antig. 22 .		202,	229	781 . 181 969 . 177
41		78,	150	761 58 978
44 .			225	816 . 44 1258 191
61			149	848 185 1342 103
69 .			62	956 . 87 Trach. 25 81
76			92	1040 27 196 215
91 .			128	1180 . 77 197 211
97			205	1442 105 226 201
98 .			92	1528 . 68 401 150
178		٠.	132	1713 176 545 191
185 .	-		111	Oed Tyr. 9 . 195 604 78
228		-	170	129 199 631 83
240 .		_	111	283 202 687 169
242	_	٠.	231	364 67 801 181
272 .	•	. •	155	895 . 159 944 109
278		٠.	84	I
872 .	•	. •	136	
875	_	٠.	126	
890 .	•	•	60	548 170 1129 81 580 215 1183 186
448		•	202	
444 .	•	•	113	637 186 1233 82
		•		651 . 183 Hippon. Fr. 280 . 172
484		•	98	786 146
584 .		•	178	796 . 138 THEOCRITUS.
544	•	•	202	834 · 27, 143 Id. I, 4 · · · 102
547 .		•	228	840 . 20
580	•	•	130	918 172 THEOGNIS.
605 .		•	106	956, 959 231 Vs. 126 145
666	•	•	135	1146 . 44, 215 153
678 .		•	284	1157 . 177
685	•		170	1281 133 THUCYDIDES.
710 .			109	1232 . 202 I, 1 219
1063			231	1245 169 2
1168 .			179	1293 205 2 226
1173		32,	191	1368
1253 .		•	84	1387 - 72, 202 3
1255			110	1391
1339 .			113	Phil. 75 19 4 198
Elect. 81	_	_	183	
833 .	•	. *	62	
637		٠.	113	
697 .	•	. •	134	
1029		•	184	
1052 .	*	•	185	825 52 10 111, 223
1172		•	141	849 201 11
1205 .	•	•	68	881 79 12 17
		•		415 281 12
Oed. Col. 12	•	•	204	444 228 16 190, 199
16		•	208	493 88 21 130
86	•	•	211	519
49			202	526 92, 179 22 128
52	•	•	122	b39 179 23 31
88		•	224	567 281 24
84	٠		172	594
170			183	611 185 27 42
174			181	617 154 28 112
176			185	674 118 81 70
271			141	674, 675
810			182	761 188 36
442			191	825 69 89
665			199	

1, 45	167	II, 2 151	III, 33	170
60	., 206	8 83	34	42
57 .	75	8 70	40	117
58	. 162		40	161
58 .	170	4 190	49	194
62	. 199	4 203	49	199
63 .	155	5 162	58	81
65	. 70	5 (2 examp.) . 167	53	84
65 .	75	7	70	75
68	. 211	8	74	99
69 .	159	11 50	75	200
69	. 211	12 203	80	81
			83	
70 .	27, 45, 109	12 211		81
70	. 34	18 11, 151	88	213
72 .	8	13 204	89	59
78	. 58, 199	13 211	89	126
74 .	224	15 7	98	137
76	. 59	18 35, 229	102	206
76	. 62	20 . 85, 59, 158, 229	114	206
76	. 199	21	IV, 4	190
79 .	8	24	18	155
81	. 234	32 13	17	188
83 .	123	34 (2 examp.) 27, 130	24	88
86, 88 .	. 234	87 109		158
90 .	38, 54, 150	89 219	28	158
90	. 143	40 160	29	226
90 .	151	41 62	86	208
91	. 6, 167	42 42	42	168
91 .	151	44 203	43	219
91	. 170	45 46	67	190
91 .	193	49 61	71	43
95	. 167	49 200	95	224
99 .	131	53 195	113	227
101	. 36	56 191, 197	115	42
103 .	140	59 220	121	42
108	. 36	60 80	125	225
111 .	218	60	128	75
113	. 140	60		227
114 .	224		V, 9	61
			٧, ٥	
115	. 86	61 126	9	209
116 .	217	61 194	10	211
116	• 224	62 130	18	209
117 .	36	63 61	80	224
118	. 81	64 44	85	42
120 .	224	64 132	85	226
121	. 88	65 187	49	164
125 .	224	67 167	56	224
126	. 31	72	63	
				193
126 .	68	80 60	64	214
128	. 214	89 46	82	60
129 .	19	92 25	102	215
131	. 112	93 83	105 82	, 85
132 .	145	102 13,193	VI, 2	5
134	. 154	III, 1 201	2	82
137 .	5	4	4	211
137	143, 162	11	6	42
138 .	000 010			
	. 208, 216	$\begin{vmatrix} 22 & \cdot & \cdot & 71 \\ 02 & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \end{vmatrix}$	9	10
140	. 56	26 42	16	6
142 .	117	28 42, 160	16	47
142	. 215	' 82 165	17	23

VI, 18						68	IVII,	70)			_	28	I, 1	0. 6					220
18	-	_	•		190	, 199	1 ,	70		•		•	191	177	0, 9		_	Ī		81
20		•		•		6	ì	71			•	- 4		1 4	0 10	•	•		•	158
20	•		•		•		1			•		. 2	7, 109	1 4	0, 16	•		•		
		•		•		174	1	72			•	•	23	1 7	0, 16	!	•		٠	160
21	•		•		•	105	1	77		•		•	87	1	0, 17	•		•		155
25				•		233		80					164		1, 3					152
29			-			169	1	84				. 8.	1, 197		1, 4	٠.	-	_	-	95
80						61	1	85			_		219		1, 6	•		•		204
81	_					7	VIII	9			-		169			•	•		•	
81	•		•		•	74	'	25		•		•	60	1	1, 8	•		•		156
87		•		•		59	1	45			•	•		1	1, 10	•		- 1	146,	, 157
	•		•		•		1			•		•	226	1	1, 21					232
88		•		•		60	1	55	•		•	•	42		1, 23					151
50			•		•	203		65		•		•	234		2, 12					184
50						234		66					108	1 -	2, 21		_		11.	151
54					78	, 192	1	68				. :	3, 214		3, 6	•	•		,	163
57						42	1	70					195		3, 10	•		•		
58	_		_		_	211	l	71	-		-	•	60	1 1	0, 10	•	•		•	206
59	•		٠		•	216	1	74		•		•		1 1	8, 11					201
61		•		•			1	**	•		•	•	42		3, 13		٠			194
	•		•		•	34		1	YF.	TA	EU	s.		1	3, 18				58,	158
61		•		•		42	VII						400	1 ;	8, 19				. '	159
61	•		٠		•	146	XII,	00	•	•	•	•	109	1 :	8, 20	٠.	-		•	33
61						165	į .	X	EN	'nΒ	TTO.	NT.			8, 24	•		•		
66						60	I								0,41	•	•		•	143
74						7	۱		An	aba	1318	•		1 :	8, 25	•		•		141
75	_	•		•		32	I, 1	, 1					6	1	3, 29	•	٠		27,	128
77	•		۰		•	6	1	, 2					25	1 1	4, 5					44
				٠			1			٠.			25		4, 5					214
78	•		٠		٠	98	Ιī	, 3	•			•	220		4, 17				26	5, 67
82		•		•		208		, 5		•		•	132	1 4	, 19			•		117
88						206	1	, ,	•	•	•	•		1 :	4, 22	•	•		•	29
96						86	1	, 6		•	•		223	1 7	4 00	•		•		
96						71	1	, 10	•		•	•	111		4, 22	•	•		•	214
100			•		•	115	2	, 1		•			218	1	5, 13	•				56
102		٠		•		158	2	, 1					220	{	5, 14		٠			64
1 102	•		•		•	100	1 2	, 2					33		5, 16					69
VIL 1						111	2	21	_	٠.			152	1 4	5, 27					162
2						84		, 6	•			٠	62		5, 27	٠.				230
5		_	•	_	•	87		è		•	•	00			3, 12	•		•	98	131
6		•		•	25	3, 61	1 8	, 6	•		•	00	, 232		3, 21	•	•		10	, 67
10	•		•		24	100	0	, 8		•	•		220			•		•	10	
		•		•		109	8	, 14	•				229	III,	1, 2					154
11	•		•		•	42	8	15		•			232		1, 18	3.				199
13		•		•		111	3.	17					35		1, 14				_	43
15	•				•	232	8.	17				5	2. 86		1, 16	3 .	-		-	146
17						87	4	7		٠.		115	2, 86 , 168		1, 20			•		199
21						42		12	Rr.	12		~	162		1, 38		•		•	
23						213		18	w	10	•							•		29
24	_	•		•		219	7	10		•		•	70		1, 3		٠		•	52
27	•		•		•	167		, 18		•	•		150		1, 40	, .		٠		29
		•		•				, 9	•			•	231		2, 9				•	161
28	•		•		•	111		13					23		2, 10),				223
84		•		•		206	6,	2					199		2, 2					26
89					•	80	6,	8					171		2, 27		•		٠,	67
42						59	7	8				_	79		2, 29			•	•	
44						224	7	8	•			•	218		0, 20	,	•		•	25
46						43	7	7		•	•				2, 36	٠,		٠		52
47	_	-	_	•	_	159	7,	10	•	•		•	155		8, 12	5	٠		•	152
48	•		٠,		•		ρ,	124		•	•		19		4, 8			•		142
		•		٠		134	8,	13					75		4, 29)				81
50	•		٠		9	211	9,	10					166		4, 49			15	22.	142
56		٠		•		42	9,	13					132		5, 8	-			,	81
59	٠		•		•	168	9.	21					67		5, 7		•		•	206
60						168		27			•		132		K 11			•		
61						61	10,		•	•		•	220		5, 11		•		•	199
67					-	75	10,	K.		•	•	11			5, 18 5, 18					152
		-		•			10.	9	•	•		11	155		0, 18	5	•			167

		. 37 0 30 00 00
1V, 1 5 194	I, 4, 23 146	
1,6 81	4, 25 68	2, 22 219
2, 4 142	5. 12 197	3, 13 51
	5, 18	3 27 . 103
	5, 14 74	8, 55 29, 180
4,6 207	0, 14	8,55 108
5, 13 108	6, 3 129	
5, 30 29, 145	6,7 76	4, 17 40
6, 10 75	6.7 138	4, 80 108
	6, 10 80	4, 35 108
	6.18 63	5, 13 9, 103
8, 14 201		5, 21
V, 1, 1 161	6, 18	
1, 9	6, 19 135	5, 84 94
2 17 162	6, 22	
3, 1 126	6. 28 160	1, 26 225
4, 10	6. 32 201	1, 40 205
4, 16 223	6, 28	
6, 3 223	II, 1, 8 28, 105	
6, 22 79	1, 9 118	2, 39 14
7.5 145	1, 21 68	
7, 26 20, 81 VI, 1, 17	1, 80	4.17 205
VI. 1. 17	1, 31	VII, 1, 10 47, 131
V1, 1, 17 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		2, 19 150
1, 19		2, 19 150
1, 25 163	2, 8 16	8, 8 171
1,26 165	2, 9 16	8, 7 167
1, 28 83	2, 16 22	8.13 184
1, 29 157	2, 20 22	8, 17 77
1, 29 107	3, 5 2	5,6 142
4,9 126	9, 0	5. 78 214
5,6 132	4, 7 29, 15	5, 78 214
6,24 230	4, 10 13	
6, 25 161	4,12 6	5, 82 31
	4, 17 5	5,82 80
1,7 203		1. 10 . 40
1, 16 162	4, 31 13	, 1,10 , 40
1,33 39	4, 31 · · · 13 III, 1, 1 · · · 8	
8, 11 . 9, 108	1, 1	1, 43 . 40, 74
8, 13 154	1,3 39,16	1, 44 . 75, 144
	1,8 68, 17	2, 21 . 110
8,43 85		2. 25 . 195
4,2 69	1,9 19	
6, 21 97	2, 1 16	
7, 11 11, 105	2.8 18	
7, 81 81	2, 12 21	1 4, 16 155, 156
	2, 13 . 77, 10	5, 12 137
• • • • • •	2, 15 21	8 5, 28 . 224
Cyropaedia.		
I, 1, 2 130		
	2, 26 4	
2, 1 82, 158	3,31 19	
2, 1 205	8, 60 21	1 7, 27 . 206
2, 2 45, 109	1 '	
2,8 145		
2,8 206	1.18 7	7 I, 1, 16 223
2, 16 94	2,7	2 6,7 162
2,10	8, 10 21	1 6, 82 185
3, 1 . 197 218		
8, 8 219		
8, 8		3 7, 26
8, 9 210	4,4 . 11, 15	2 7, 28 203
8, 11 143	5, 15 20	6 II. 1. 4 151
0 10	5, 87 14	4 1,6 217
3, 18 83	5, 46 19	
4, 2 81	, 10	
4,7 168	V, 1, 3 227, 25	8 8, 11 . 39, 138, 207
4. 13 155	1, 25 20	
4, 14 . 145, 168	2, 9	1 4,1 . 225
4 01 400		2 4,8 206
4, 21 168	1 4, 5 4.	-1 -, -,

III 1, 20 165 I, 2, 7 67 IV, 1, 3	213
2, 6 . 164 2, 7 . 168 2, 3	80
$2, 18 \dots 226$ $2, 18 \dots 17$ $2, 4 \dots$	78
2, 19	214
2, 20 143, 168 2, 22 22 217 2, 10	80
8, 6 202 2, 36 183 2, 12	83
8, 9	129
5, 9 208 2, 55 197 2, 30	232
5, 10 86 2, 68	134
IV, 1, 36 199 3, 3 165 2, 35	46
1, 38 10 3, 6 207 2, 39	80
1, 38 . 29, 174 4, 19 172 2, 40 . 1 4, 15 . 203 5, 2 203 8, 3	1, 108
4, 15	18
	59 216
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
8, 23 205 7, 2 234 4, 16	156 68
	190
	11
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	51
2, 2	7, 109
2, 29	197
2, 29	172
2, 86 191 2, 3 . 81, 141	
4,7 · · 23 2,3 · · 134 Ages. II, 31 .	100
4, 7 33 3, 3	163
4, 8 161 3, 4 172 IV, 6	207 168
4, 9	137
VI. 1. 5 132 3, 12 129 XI 3	109
1 14 88 6, 2 • 126 Apol 5 14	178
4.6 . 161 6, 29 · 161 Cyneg, HI. 2.	196
4 26 210 0, 32 223 High VIII 2	179
4. 27 . 40 7, 10 98 XI. 15	184
VII, 1, 23 , 150 7, 18 , 141 Hipp. IX, 2	77
1.84 . 152 5,2 Oe Oecon. I, 2	188
1, 34 164 5, 2	183
1, 35 150 10, 2 68 VII, 5	74
1, 38	139
2, 9	52
3, 7 135 2, 8 . 9, 67 VIII, 8 .	172
4, 34	207
4, 37 . 142 8, 11 . 192, 197 XIII, 4 . 4, 39 . 165 5, 1 . 183 XV, 2.	191
	163
5 94 000 Day Ast 7 40	77
Memorabilia. 6, 8	127
1, 5	36 81
1, 13 168 8, 8 196 Symp. III 8	202
1, 16	172
2, 1 · · · 205 11, 1 · · · 234 1V 26	214
2, 8 · · 198 12, 6 · · 205 VII 2	76
2, 6 169 13, 8 . 196, 206 VIII, 25 .	74

ENGLISH INDEX.

N. B. The figures refer to Pages.

Absolute, Genitive, 222, 225, 232; Accusative, 224, 225.

Antecedent, definite or indefinite, 121, 122, 123 - 125.

Aorist, Indicative 24. Distinguished from Imperf., 7, 8, 24. Of verbs denoting a state or condition, 24. Used for Perf. or Pluperf., 25. Expressing a momentary action just taking place, 25. In epistles, 25. In Final clauses, 72. In Protasis and Apodosis (implying nonfulfilment of condition), 93-102; how distinguished from Imperf., 94, 96 (b); how from Pluperf., 96 (b). With av in Apod., 56, 93-96; rarely referring to present time, 101. Gnomic, 45; with $\pi o \lambda$ λάκις or ήδη, 46; in Hom. similes, 46; a primary tense, 49; see Aor. Inf. Iterative, w. av, 47; iterative forms in -σκον, -σκόμην (w. αν, in Hdt.), 47, 48.

—, in dependent moods, 25-36. How distinguished from Present, 8 (R.). See Contents, Chap. II.; and Subj., Opt., Imperat., and Infin.

Subjunctive, 26-28. As Fut. Perf., after ἐπειδάν, &c., 26. How distinguished from Perf. Subj., 28. With μή in prohibitions, 180. With οὐ μή, 184.

Optative, 28 – 30. After ἐπειδή, &c.,
 In indirect quotations and questions,
 30; ambiguity of, in indirect questions,
 30.

, Imperative, 30. Rarely used in prohibitions (for Aor. Subj.), 181.

After χράω, θεσπίζω, &c., 31; see Present. After αιτιός είμι, 32. In indirect quotation, referring to the past, 32, 38. Used for the Future: after verbs of hoping, promising, &c., 32; after verbs of thinking, saying, &c., 33. After λέγω and είπου, to command, 34. Primary or secondary telse, 53. In a gnomic

sense, 46, 47. With $\tilde{a}\nu$ in a podosis, 59, 113, 114, 157; see $^{\circ}A\nu$.

Participle, 34-36. With λανθόνω, φθάνω, &c, coinciding with the verb in time, 34; with περιοράω, &c, 35. With δμολογέω, 36. With έχω, as periphrastic Per., 229. With έσομαι, as periphrastic Per., 44. Primary or secondary tense, 54. As protasis, equiv. to Aor. Ind., Subj., or Opt., 110, 217. With άν in apodosis (never in protasis), 59, 113, 114, 159; see 'Aν.

Apodosis, defined, 87, 125; see Protasis. Assimilation in conditional Relative clauses, 135, 136.

Causal sentences, 171-173; see Contents, Chap. IV, Sect. V. Introduced by Relatives, 141; negative particle in, 142. Expressed by Participles, 216; by Part w. ω̂s, 219, 220.

Caution, verbs of; see Fear.

Conditional sentences, 110 - 121; see Contents, Chap. IV, Sect. II. Cond. Relative sentences, 125 - 137.

Danger, expressions of; see Fear.
Dative after Verbals in -réos, 233, 234.
Dependence of moods and tenses, 48-54.

Direct Quotations, distinguished from indirect, 147; introduced by öτι, 171.

Exhortations, Imperative in, 178. Subj. in, 179. Opt. in (poet.), 175. Fut. Ind. in, w. δπως (sc. σκόπει), 78, 79.

Fear, caution, and danger, expressions of, 80-87. Followed by μή w. Subj. or Opt., 80, see Object clauses; by μή w. Fut. Ind. (seldom), 82; by μή w. Pres. and Past tenses of Indic., 83-85; by φ or ὅπως w. Indic. (as in indir discourse).

85; by Fut. Inf., 85; by ϵi , whether, $\ddot{o}\pi\omega s$, how, &c., 85; by a causal sentence with $\ddot{o}\tau \iota$, 86; by Infin., 86, 87, 190.

Final clauses (pure), after iνα, ώς, ὅπως, ὅφρα, and μή, 67 – 73; distinguished from object clauses, &c., 66, 67. Subj. and Opt. in, 67. Fut. Ind. in, 68. Subj. in, after secondary tenses, 70. Secondary tenses of Indic. in, 72. 'Αν οτ κέ in: with Subj. 69; w. Opt., 69, 70.

Final and Object clauses w. δπως and δπως μής after verbs of striving, effecting, &c., 73 - 80. Fut. Ind. in, 73, 74. Subj. or Opt. in, 73, 74: Fut. Opt. 74, 39. *Oπως ἀν w. Subj. in, 76. Homeric construction in, 76, 77. Mή (without ὅπως) in, 77. `Ως for ὅπως in, 77. After verbs of exhorting, forbidding, &c., 77, 78; rarely introduced by ἕνα, 78; see ἕνα. *Oπως or ὅπως μή w. Fut. Ind., by ellipsis of the leading verb, 78 (N. 7, α); μή alone in prohibitions, 79 (N. 7, b). Second Aor. Subj. Act. and Mid. preferred in, 79; Dawes's Canon, 79, 80. See Object clauses after μή.

Finite moods, 1.

Future, Indicative, 36-38. In gnomic sense, 36. Expressing a general truth hereafter to be recognized, 36. Like mild imperative, 37. In prohibitions w. μή, 37, 79. In Final clauses, w. ὅπως, ὅφρα, μή, 68. With ὅπως or ὅπως μή, after verbs of striving, effecting, &c. 73. With ὅπως or ὅπως μή, in exhortations and prohibitions (sc. σκόπει), 78. With μή, after verbs of fearing, 82. In Protasis w. εί: expressing a future condition, 103; expr. a present intention, &c., 93. In Rel. clauses expr. a purpose, 137. With οὐ μή, 184–187. With ἀν: in Homer, 56; in Attic, 56. Periphrastic form of, w. μέλλω, 38.

Optative, in indirect quotation, 38.

After ὅπως οτ ὅπως μή, 39-41, 73, 74.

Infinitive, 41 - 43. After verbs of saying, thinking, &c., in indirect quotation, 41. For Pres. or Aor. Inf., after verbs of wishing, &c., after ωστε, and even in other constructions, 42. Regularly used after verbs of hoping, &c., 43. With αν (rarely), 60. Primary or secondary tense, 53.

pose, 217, 214. With ἄν (rarely), 60. Primary or secondary tense, 53.

Future Perfect, Indicative, 43-45. Compound forms of: Perf. Part. w. ἔσομαι, 44; rarely Aor. Part. w. ἔσομαι, 44, 215.

Often nearly = Fut., 44 In the dependent moods, 44.

General and particular suppositions, how distinguished, 88, 89.

Genitive Absolute, 222, 225, 232.

Gnomic Aorist and Perf. See Aor. and Perf.

Hindrance, verbs implying, w. Infin., 198-202. See Infinitive.

Hoping, promising, &c., verbs of, w. Fut. Infin., 43; w. Pres. Infin., 14; w. Ace Inf., 32, 33.

Imperative, 2. Tenses of, see Present, Perfect, &c. Not used w. $\tilde{\omega}_{\nu}$, 57. In commands, exhortations, &c., 178; w. $\tilde{\omega}_{\gamma}$, $\phi \acute{e}_{\rho e}$, $i\theta_{\iota}$, 178; second person w. $\pi \tilde{a}_{\gamma}$, 179. After $olog^{\rho}$ \tilde{a}_{ν} , &c., 179. In prohibitions w. $\mu \acute{\eta}$ (Present, rarely Aor.), 180, 181.

Imperfect, 6-8. Distinguished from Aor., 7, 8, 24. Denoting attempted action, 7. In sense of Pluperf. (when Pres. = Perf.), 7. Sometimes not distinguished from Acr., 7, 8. Expressing past likelihood, intention, or danger, 7. Expressing a fact just recognized, 8. In Final clauses, 72. In Protasis or Apodosis (implying non-fulfilment of condition), 93 - 102; how distinguished from Aor., 94, 96 (b); how from Pluperf., 96 (b); in Hom. usually past, 96. With av, in Apodosis, 56, 93 - 96. Iterative, w. av, 47; iterative forms in -σκον and -σκόμην (w. αν, in Hdt.), 47, 48. How expressed in Infin. and Part. (Imperf. Inf. and Part.), 15, 17. How expressed in Optative (Imperf. Opt.), 153.

Indicative, 1. Tenses of, see Present, &c. Primary and secondary tenses of, 3, 49, 50. With av, see Av. Fut., in Final and Object clauses after ὅπως, &c.; see Future. Secondary tenses of, in Final clauses, 72. Present and past tenses of, after un, lest, 83-85. Present and past tenses of, in Protasis, 92. Secondary tenses of, in both Protasis and Apodosis (av in Apod.), 93 - 102; see "Av. Fut.: in Protasis, 103; in Apodosis, 102. For Subj. in general suppositions, 109. After Relative w. definite antecedent, 122. In causal Rel sentences, 141. In condi tional Rel. sentences: present and past tenses, 125; secondary tenses (implying non-fulfilment of a condition), 126. For Subj. and Opt. in general suppositions after Rel., 131. In Rel. sentences after a general negative, 132. Secondary tenses of, in cond. Rel. sentences, by assimilation, 136. Future after Rel., expressing a purpose, 137. Fut. after ed & and έφ' ώτε, 140. After ώστε, 140. After εως, &c., until, 142; second. tenses, referring to a result not attained, 143, After πρίν, 145; distinguished from Infin., 144, 145, 210. In indirect quotation after on and ws, and in indir. questions, 149, 150; may be retained even after second. tenses, 151, 152; in dependent clauses of indir. quot., 160 - 165. In causal sentences, 171. Secondary tenses of, in wishes, 173, 176. Future after ού $\mu\eta$, 185, 184; see Future.

Indirect Questions, 147; see Contents, Chap. IV, Sect. IV.

Indirect Quotation, 147-171; see Contents, Chap. IV, Sect. IV. Moods used in, see Indicative, &c. Tenses used in, see Present, &c.; and Contents, Chap. II.

Infinitive, 2, 188 – 212. Tenses of, 212; see Present, &c., and Contents, Chap. II. With $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$, see " $\Delta\nu$. After verbs of fearing, 86, 87, 190. In Apodosis, 113. In indirect quotations, 147, 148, 157 – 159. After & peckov in wishes, 176, 177. Fut. w. ov $\mu\dot{\eta}$, in indir. quot., 185. See Contents, Chap. V.

Interrogative Subj., 182 - 184. In indirect questions, 154.

Iterative Imperfect and Aorist. See Imperfect and Aorist.

Moods, general view of, Chap. I. Use of, Chap. IV. Constructions enumerated, 65; see Indicative, &c.

Narration, Infin. in, 210.

Object clauses with μή after Verbs of fearing, &c., 66, 80. Subj. and Opt. in, 80. Mή and μὴ οὐ in, 80, 67. How related to Final clauses, 66, 81. Fut. Ind. in, 82. "Όπως μή (= μή) in, 82. Mὴ ἀν w. Opt. (in Apod.) in, 82, 83. Mή alone w. Subj., by ellipsis of the leading verb, 83. Mή w. present and past tenses of Indic. in, 83 -85, foot-note † to 84. Other constructions allowed in, see Fear, caution, and danger.

Dptative, 2, 174. Its relations to the Indic. and Subjunctive., Appendix I. Tenses of, see Present, &c.; when primary and when secon day, 50 - 53. With wa, öπως,

&c., in pure Fin. clauses, 67. With ὅπως and ὅπως μή, after verbs of striving, &c.. (seldom), 73, 74. With un, after verbs of fearing, &c., 80. In Protasis w. ei, 91: in particular suppositions, 105; in general suppos., 107, 108. In Apodosis w. av. 57, 105, see 'Av : w. Protasis suppressed, 112; as mild command or exhortation, or resembling Fut. Ind., 113. In conditional Rel. sentences: in particular suppositions, 128; in general suppos., 129; by assimilation, 135. In Rel. clauses expressing a purpose (Epic. rarely Attic), 138. After ews, &c., until. 142, 143; implying a purpose, 143, 166-168 (d). After πρίν, 145. In indirect quotations and questions, 148; see Contents, Chap. IV, Sect. IV. In causal sentences, 172. In wishes, 173, 174; expressing concession or exhortation, 175. Future, 38 - 41; rarely w. ού μή, after ως in indirect quotation, 185.

Participle, 8, 213-232. Tenses of, see Present, &c. With αν, see Aν. Conditional (as Protasis) representing Indic., Subj., or Opt., 217, 110. As Apodosis (with or without αν), 113. In indirect quotation, 159, 229. See Contents, Chap. VI.

Particular and general suppositions, how distinguished, 88, 89.

Perfect Indicative, 18, 19. Why primary, 18. Compound form of, 18. Of certain verbs, in sense of Present, 19. In epis ties, 19. Referring to the future for emphasis (δλωλα), 19. Not used w. ἄν, 55. Gnomic, 45; see Perf. Infin.

in dependent moods, relations of to Pres. of those moods, 19. Subj. and Opt., 20. Imperat., 21: in mathematical language, 21; second person of (rare), 22; in sense of Present, 22. Infin., 22: w. ωφελον in wisbes, 176, 177; primary or secondary tense, 53; w. ων, 59; in a gnomio sense, 47; as Pluperf. Infin., 23 (Rem.), 59. Partic., 23; primary or secondary, 53.

Pluperfect, 18, 19. Compound form of, 18. Of certain verbs, in sense of Imperf., 19. Sometimes nearly = Aor. (Hom. and Hdt.), 19. Expressing past certainty, &c., 19. In Final clauses, 72. In Protasis and Apodosis, how distinguished from Imperf. and Aor., 96 (b). With āv, in Apod., 56, 93, 94. How expressed in Infin. and Partic., 23 (Rem.).

Present, Indicative, 4. Expressing a general truth, 4, 46; an attempted action, 5.
With adverbs of past time (as πάλαι), 5.
Of certain verbs, in sense of Perf., 5.
Of verbs signifying to hear, to learn, &c., 6.
Of εlμι, as Fut., sometimes as Pres., 6. Expressing likelihood, intention, or danger, 6. Not used w. āν, 55. Historic, 6; a secondary tense, 49.

, in dependent moods, 8-17. How distinguished from the Aor., 8. See Contents, Chap. II.; and Subj., Opt., Imperat., and Infin.

Subjunctive, 9, 10. In first person, in prohibitions w. μή, 180; see Aor. Subj. With οὐ μή, 184.

—, Optative, 10 - 12. In indirect quotations and questions, 11; ambiguity in indirect questions, 12.

______, Imperative, 12. In prohibitions w. μή, 180. See Aor. Subj.

Infinitive, three uses of, 12. With indef. time, 12. After χράω, θεσπίζω, &c., 13. In indirect quotation, 13. For Fut., after verbs of hoping, &c., 14. After λέγω and εἶπον, to command, 14. As Imperfect Infin, 15, 16. With ἀν in Apodosis, 58, 113, 157; see ʿΑν. With ἀν, representing iterative Imperf., 60. Primary or secondary tense, 53.

——, Participle, 16, 17. As imperf. Part.,
 17. Primary or secondary, 53. As Protasis (= Pres. Ind., Subj., or Opt.), 110,
 217. With αν, in Apod. (never in Prot.),
 58, 113, 159; see 'Aν.

Prevention, verbs implying, w. Inf., 198-202. See Infinitive.

Primary and Secondary tenses, 3, 48 - 54; see Tenses.

Prohibitions, Subj. and Imperat. in, 180; Aor. Imperat. rare in, 181. Fut. Ind. in, w. ὅπως μή οτ μή (so. σκόπει), 78. See οὐ μή.

Promising, verbs of ; see Hoping.

Protasis and Apodosis, defined, 87. Moods and tenses in, see indic., &c.; Present, &c.; and Contents, Chap. IV., Sect. II.

Purpose, expressed by Final clause w. τνα, &c., 67; by Relat. w. Fut. Ind., 137; by Rel. w. Subj. and Opt. in Hom. (rarely in Attic), 138; by έως w. Subj. and Opt., 143, 167, 168 (d); by ώστε w. Infin., 205; by Inf. alone, 203; by Fut. Part., 214, 217.

Questions, of doubt, w. first pers. of Subj. (sometimes w. βούλει or θέλεις), 182; rarely w. third person of Subj., 183: see

Subjunctive. Indirect, 147; see Indirect quotation.

Quotation, see Direct and Indirect.

Relative and Temporal sentences, 121 - 146; see Contents, Chap. IV., Sect. III. Relative with Infinitive, 193.

Secondary, see Tenses.

Similes (Homeric): Gnomic Aor. in, 46, 133; Subj. (without \(\tilde{a}\rhu\)) and Pres. Indic. in, 133.

Subjunctive, 1. Its relations to the Opt., Appendix I. Tenses of ; see Pres., Perf., and Aor.; always primary, 50. With αν οτ κέ, see 'Αν. With ϊνα, ὅπως, &c. in pure Final clauses, 67: after secondary tenses, 70. With ὅπως and ὅπως μή after verbs of striving, &c. (seldom), 73. With un after verbs of fearing, &c., 80. In Protasis w. ἐάν (ἄν, ῆν), 90, 91; in particular suppositions, 102; in general suppos., 107, 108; w. el (without av), see 'Aν. In Apodosis w. κέ or άν (Hom.), 57, 182; see 'Av. In conditional Relat. sentences: in particular suppositions, 127; in general suppos., 129; by assimilation, 135. In Homeric similes after ώς, ώς ὅτε, 132. In Rel. causes expressing a purpose (Epic), 138. After εως, &c., until, 142, 143; implying a purpose, 143, 167, 168 (d). After πρίν, 145. In indirect questions, representing Interrog. Subj., 154, 155. In indir. quotations, repres. de pendent Subj., 148, 160; may be changed to Opt. or retained, after second, tenses, 148, 160, 166. First person of, in exhor tations, 179; see aye, φέρε. Aor. in prohibitions w. un, 180; Pres. only in first person (rarely sing.), 180, 181. Inde pendent (like Fut. Ind.) in Hom., 181; w. av or ké, 182. Interrog. (in questions of doubt), 182. With où μή, as strong future, 184.

Temporal sentences, see Relative. With $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega_{S}$, &c., until, 142-144. With $\pi\rhoi\nu$, 144-147, 210.

Tenses, enumeration of, 3. Primary and secondary, 3, 48-54. Relative or absolute time denoted by, 3, 4. Gnomic and iterative, 45-48. Use of, see Contents Chap. II. See also Present, &c.

Verbal in -réos, 3; see Contents, Chap. VII

Wish, expression of, 173-177; see Contents, Chap. IV., Sect. VI. Ind and Opt. in, see Ind. and Opt. Latin and Greek expressions of, compared, 177. Infin in (poet.), 209.

GREEK INDEX.

N. B. The figures refer to Pages.

Αγανακτεω εί, 120. Άναπάω εί. 120. Aye or ayere w. Imperat., 178, 179, 180. 'Aδικέω as Perf., 5. Aισχύνομαι with Part, and Inf., 228. Aiσχύνομαι εί. 120. Αἰτιός είμι, w. Inf. (sometimes w. τοῦ or τό), 190, 191; w. Aor. Inf., 32. 'Ακούειν, ἀκοῦσαι, in sound, 196. Αλίσκομαι as Perf., 5. 'Aλλά or αὐτάρ (like δέ) in Apodosis, 121, 137 (Rem.) Aµa w. Partic., 219. $A\nu$ (\check{a}), Adv., two uses of, in Apodosis and in Protasis, 54. Not used w. Pres. and Perf. Indic., 55. With Fut. Ind.: in early poets, 55, 104; in Attic, 56. With secondary tenses of Ind. in Apodosis, 56. 87, 90, 94, 127; omitted for emphasis, 96; regularly omitted in Apod. formed by Infin. and ἐχρῆν, ἔδει, &c., 97-100. With Imperf. and Aor. Ind. in iterative sense, With Subjunctive: in Protasis (ἐάν, αν, or ην), 56, 87, 102, 108; in conditional Rel. and Temporal clauses, 56, 125, 128, 130, 143, 144, 145; often omitted in Hom. (rarely in Attic), 104, 105, 109, 133. In Final clauses after ως ὅπως, ὅφρα: W. Subj., 68, 69; rarely w. Opt. 69, 70. Omitted from ear, orar, os ar, &c., when the Subj. is changed to Opt. after past tenses, 149; rarely retained, Seldom w. ws and Subj. **163**, 169. in Hom. similes, 132. Epic use of, w. Subj. in Apodosis, 57, 104, 182. With Optative, always forming Apodosis, 57, 105, 128, see Optative; never w. Fut. Opt., 57; rarely omitted, 100. With an Opt. in Protasis which is also an Apod., 107, 133. Ei ke W. Opt. in Hom., 107. Never used w. Imperat., 57. With Infin. and Part.: in Apodosis, 57 - 61, 113, 157, 159, 192, 232; never in Protasis, 62; use

Inf. for iterative Imperf. and Aor w. αν, 60. Position of, 61, 62. Repetition of, 62-64. Without a verb, 63. Τάχ' αν, perhaps, 64.

"Αν (α), contracted for, ἐάν. See Ἐάν.
"Αναμέω, to give an oracular response, see Χράω.
"Ανέχομαι w. Part., 228.
'Αποκάμνω w. Part. and Inf., 228.
'Αρκέω w. Part., 228.
'Ατε, ἄτε δή, w. Part., 219.
Αλγίκα w. Part., 219.

of each tense with, see Present, &c. With

Βελτίων w. Part., 228. Βούλει οτ βούλεσθε w. Interrog. Subj., 182. Βουλομένω μοι τοῦτό ἐστιν, 229.

Αχρι, see Εως. 'Αχρι ού, 142.

Peyovévai, to be, 19.

Δε, in Apodosis, 121. In antecedent clauses, 137. Δείκνυμι w. Part., 229. Δεινόν ἐστιν εί, 120. Δῆλός είμι w. Part., 230. Διατελέο w. Part., 227; see Λανθάνω. Δίδωμι, to offer, 5. Imperf. of, 7. Δίκαιος w. Inf., 195. Δίκαιος w. Inf., 195. Δίτι, 171; w. Inf. (Hdt.), 193.

Έάν (ei $\tilde{a}\nu$), contracted $\tilde{a}\nu$ (\tilde{a}) or $\tilde{\eta}\nu$, 56, 87, 104; w. Subj., 102, 108. Έβουλόμην with Infinitive in Apodosis, without $\tilde{a}\nu$, 98.

Έδει, ἐχρῆν (χρῆν), ἐξῆν, ἐνῆν προσῆκεν εἰκὸς ἦν ῆρμοττεν, ἦν οι ὑπῆρχεν, with Infin. in Apodosis, without ἄν, 97 - 100. Εί, if, 87, 92, 93, 105, 108; see 'Αν. Supvosina that. 115. 168. After θανιμάζω.

ks, t), 51, 52, 50, 105, 105, 1 see - Supposing that, 115, 168. After θαυμάζω, &c., 120. With Inf. (Hdt.), 193. Es yάρ, or ei, in wishes, 173 - 177. 262 Ei, whether, 120, 147, 151; after verbs | Ίδειν, οράν, in appearance, 196 of fearing. 85. Eί γάρ in wishes, see Εί. Eί δ' άγε, 111. Eί δè μή in alternatives, 112. Ei $\theta \epsilon$ in wishes, 173 - 177. Einds ar in Apodosis, see Edet. Elui to be going : as Future, 6; as Pres., 6; w. Inf., 204. Elvai, expressing a purpose, 204. Elπον, I commanded, w. Inf., 14, 34. Eis ö (for εως) w. Indic. (Hdt.), 142. Είσόκε w. Subj. and Opt., 143; see Eως. Έκὼν είναι, 208. "Event, Partic, of, used personally w. Inf., 194, 195. "Ενην in Apodosis, see "Εδει. Eξαίφνης w. Part., 219. 'Eέην in Apodosis, see 'Εδει. *Επάν οτ ἐπήν, see "Οταν. Έπεάν, Ionic for ἐπήν. *Επει or ἐπειδή (temporal); w. Aor. Indic. (not Pluperf.), 25; w. Aor. Opt., 29; w. Infin., 193. Causal, 171. "Επειδάν, w. Aor. Subj. as Fut. Perf., 26. See OTav. 'Επίδοξος w. Inf. 195. Επικαίριος W. Inf., 195. Επιμελέομαι (ἐπιμέλομαι), W. ὅπως and Fut. Ind., 73; w. Inf., or Inf. w. του, 192 Επιτήδειος W. Inf., 195. Έπιτρέπω w. Part., 226. 'Eστε, until, see 'Eως. Εὐθύς w. Part., 219. Ευρίσκω w. Part., 226. "Εφην, in Homer, 99. 'Εφ' ω or έφ' ωτε, w. Fut. Ind., 140; w Inf., 207. 'Εχρην in Apodosis. See 'Εδει. "Eχω w. Aor. or Perf. Part. as periphrastic

Perf., 229. Έως, έστε, ἄχρι, μέχρι, εἰσόκε, όφρα, until, 142-144; expressing a purpose, 143, 167, 168, 'Eως, ὄφρα, so long as, see Relative. 'Hκω as Perf., 5. Imperf. of, 7. "Homorrey in Apodosis, see 'Ebel.

Θαθμα ίδέσθαι, 196. Θαυμάζω εί, θαυμαστόν έστιν εί, 120. Θέλεις οτ θέλετε w. Interrog. Subjunctive (poet.), 182. Θεσπίζω, see Χράω.

'Hrráouai, as Perf., 5.

'Iθι w. Imperat., 178. 'Iκανός w. Part., 228.

"Ικω or ἰκάνω as Perf. (Hom.), 5.

"Iva. in Final clauses: w. Subj. and opt. 67, 70; w. second. tenses of Indic 72. Not used with $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$, 70; $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ $\kappa\epsilon$, 70. In Object clauses after λίσσομαι (Hom.), 78; similar constr. in N. Test., 78.

-, where, with av, 70 (R.).

Ká. Doric for ké; see Av. Καί, καίπερ (καί . . . περ), w. Part., 220, 221. Καίτοι w. Part. (rare), 221. Ké or κέν, see 'Av. Keκλησθαι, to be called, 19. Κινδυνεύω w. Inf. in Apodosis, 99. Κρατέω, вее Νικάω. Κρείσσων w. Part., 228. Κυρέω W. Part. (poet.), 227.

Δανθάνω, φθάνω, τυγχάνω, διατελέω, 👿 Part., 227; w. Aor. Part., 34. Λέγω, to command, w. Inf., 14, 34.

Mέλλω, w. Inf. as periphrastic Fut., 38; tense of Inf with, 38. Imperf. of, w. Inf.: expressing past intention, &c., 38, 99; forming Apodosis (without av), 99.

Mέμνημαι, I remember, 19; w. Part., 229; ₩. ὅτε, 231.

Μεταξύ w. Part., 219.

Μέγοι, see Εως, Μέγοι οδ, 142.

Mή, lest, in Final clauses: w. Subj. and Opt., 67, 70; rarely w. Fut Ind., 68. After verbs of striving, &c. (for onws un), 77. With Fut. Ind. in prohibitions, 37. 79, 187. After verbs of fearing, &c.: w. Subj. and Opt., 80; w. Fut. Ind., 82. With Subj. (by ellipsis of a verb of fearing), 83. With av, 83. With present and past tenses of Indic., 83 - 85; never interrog., 84. With Fut. Opt. 89, 40.

-, not, w. ενα, δπως, &c., in Final and Object clause, 67. In Protasis, 88 In Rel. clauses w. indef. anteced., 122, 124. In wishes (with and without ei), 174, 176. In prohibitions, 180. With interrog. Subj., 181. With Inf., after verbs implying negation, 198, 200, 201.

Mη ου (double neg.): w. Inf., 198, 200, 201; w. Part., 200; before Nouns, 200.

Nikaw and kparéw, as Perf., 5. Νομίζω, οιομαι, and φημί, w. Aorist. Inf referring to the future (!), 33.

'O for 571 (in Hom.), 170. Οίδα (novi), I know, 19; see Οίσθα. Olona, W. Aor. Inf. for Fut. (?), 38. Olos w. Infin., 194. Οlov, ola, ola δή, w. Part., 219. Οίσθ' δ δράσον ; 179. Oixonas as Perf., 5. Imperf. of, 7. 'Ολίγου (δείν), almost, 208. 'Ολλυμαι as Perf. (Trag.), 5. 'Ολωλα, I shall perish, 19. Oμοίος W. Infin. (Hom.), 197. 'Οπόταν, вен Οταν. 'Oπότε, when, see Relative. Since (causal),

171. *Oπως, originally Rel. Adv., 75; as indirect inter.og., 75, 77, 85, 154. In order that, that, in Final clauses; w. Subj. and Opt., 67, 70; w. av and Subj., 68, 69; w. Fut. Ind., 68; w. second tenses of Indic., 72. After verbs of striving, &c.: w. Fut. Ind. (sometimes Subj. and Opt.), 73; w. aν and Subj. (rare), 76. That (like μή), after verbs of fearing, &c., 85. That (like ws or out), in indirect quotations, 170.

'Oπως μή (for μή), lest, that, after verbs of fearing, &c., 82.

*Opâv, iδείν, in appearance. 196.

"Ocov or ws w. Absol. Infin. 207.

*Ooos w. Infin. 294.

*Οστις ἄν ή, "Οστις ποτ' ἐστίν, 134.

"Οταν, ὁπόταν, ἐπάν οτ ἐπήν (ἐπεάν), and

ἐπειδάν, 55, 125, 127, 129; see 'Aν. 'Oτe, when, see Relative. After μέμνημαι, 231. With Infin., 193.

—, since (causal), 171.

*Ort, that, in indirect quotations, 147. w. Ind. and Opt., 148, 149, 150; w. Ind. or Opt. w. av, 156. Before direct quot., 171. -, because (causal), 171-173, see Contents, Chap. IV., Sect. V.; after verbs of fearing, 86.

'Ο τι ποτ' έστίν, "Οστις ποτ' έστίν, &c , 134. Où, after $\mu\dot{\eta}$, lest, 67, 80. In Apodosis, 88; rarely in Protasis, 88 (N.). In Rel. clauses w. def. anteced., 122. In causal Rel. clauses, 142 (R.). In indirect discourse, 149.

Οὐκ ἀν φθάνοις (φθάνοιτε), 228.

Ούκ οίδα αν εί, 62.

Où μή, 184-187; see Contents, Chapter IV., Section VIII. Dawes's Canon on, 79, 80.

Oüveka, because, 171.

Ούτως, implying a Protasis, 110. With Opt. in protestations, 175. Referring to a Participle, 218

"Οφελον, вее ' Ωφελον.

"Oboa (Epic and Lyric), as final particle: w. Subj. and Opt., 67; w. av, 69. With Fut. Ind., 68.

-, as temporal particle. until. 142 -144; see εως. So long as, see Relative.

Πάλαι w. Present, 5.

Παντοΐος γίγνομαι (Ion.) w. Participle. 227. Πάρος (like πρίν) w. Inf. (Hom.), 212.

Has w. Imperat. (2d pers.), 179. Παύω w. Part., 226.

Πείθω, to try to persuade. 5. Imperfect of, 7.

Πειράομαι W. Part. (Hdt.), 227.

Περιοράω, W. Part., 226; W. Aor. Part., 35. Πιστεύω W. Inf. and τω. 197.

Πολλός είμι, πολλὸς έγκειμαι, w. Part. (Ion.), 227.

Πρέπει, Partic. of, used personally w. Infin., 194, 195.

Πρίν, w. Ind., Subj., and Opt., 145, 146. With Infin., 210-212. As Adverb, sooner, 146 (N. 5).

Πρίν ν' ὅτε (Hom.), 146.

Ποὶν η, 146, 211, 212.

Προσδεχομένω μοι τοῦτό έστιν, 229.

Προσήκεν in Apodosis, see Έδει.

Προσήκει, Partic. of, used personally w. Infin., 194, 195.

Πρόσθεν η, 146, 211.

Πρότερον ή, 146, 211.

Πῶς γὰρ ἄν; Πῶς οὐκ ἄν; &ο., 63.

Σύνοιδα, συγγιγνώσκω, w. Part., 230

Τάχ' ἄν, 64.

Teθνηκέναι, to be dead, 19.

-τέος (-τέον, -τέα), Verbal in, 3, 233, 234; see Contents, Chapter VII.

Τί λέξεις; 38.

Tí μαθών; Tí παθών; wherefore? 221. 222.

Τί πάθω; 183, 184,

Τίκτω (in tragedy) as Perf., 5.

Tò vũv elvat, 208.

Τυγχάνω w. Part., 227; see Λανθάνω.

Υστερον ή w. Infin., 211.

Φανερός είμι w. Part., 230. Φανερον ποιείν w. Part., 230.

Φέρε W. Imperat., 178, 179, 180.

Φεύγω as Perf., 5.

Φημί w. Aor. Inf. for Fut. (?), 33, Φθάνω w. Part., 227; see Δανθάνω. Φθάνω η w. Infin. (Hdt.), 212.

Χράω, ἀναιρέω, θεσπίζω, w. Pres. or Aor. | 'Ως, because, 171 - 173. Inf., 13, 31; sometimes w. Fut. Inf., 13.

'Os, originally Rel. Adv., 75 (R.). In order that, that, in Final clauses: w. Subj. and Opt., 67, 70; w. av and Subj., 68, 69; w. Fut. Ind., 68; w. second. tenses of Indic., 72. Sometimes (for ὅπως) after verbs of striving, &c., 77 (N. 4); Homeric construction of, with Subj. or Opt., 76 (N. 2.). Sometimes (for $\mu\dot{\eta}$) after verbs of fearing, 85.

-, when, see Relative With Infin., 193.

-, that, in indirect quotation (like öπ), 147, 148, 149, 150. Once w. Subj. for Fut. Ind. (Hom.), 78, 171.

-, in wishes: w. Opt., 175; w. ωφελον, 177. With Inf., 206, 207, 208. With Partic., 219, 220, 225, 231, 232; w. Part. and av 232.

*Ωσπερ w. Partic., 219, 222, 225.

"Ωσπερ αν εί (ωσπερανεί), 63, 116.

* Oore, so that, w. Indic., 140 With Inf., 205: after verbs and adject, which commonly take Inf. alone, 206 (N. 2.), 205. With Opt., Indic., or Inf. w. av, 141, 207. With Imperat., 141.

—, in Homer, = ωσπερ, as if, 207. In Hdt., w. Partic., = are, 219, 223.

"Ωφελον or ωφελλον in wishes, 98, 178, 177.

THE END.

GREEK.

GOODWIN'S GREEK GRAMMAR. By WILLIAM W. GOODWIN, Ph. D., Eliot Professor of Greek Literature in Harvard University. 12mo. Half morocco. 262 pages.

The object of this Grammar is to state general principles clearly and distinctly, with special regard to those who are preparing for college. In the sections on the Moods are stated, for the first time in an elementary form, the principles which are elaborated in detail in the author's "Syntax of the Greek Moods and Tenses."

This work was first published in 1860, and it appeared in a new form - much enlarged and in great part rewritten—in 1865. In the present edition the whole has been again revised; some sections and notes have been rewritten, and a few notes have been added. The object of the work is to give a plain statement of the principles which govern the construction of the Greek Moods and Tenses, - the most important and the most difficult part of Greek Syntax.

GOODWIN'S GREEK READER. Consisting of Extracts from Xenophon, Plato, Herodotus, and Thucydides; being the full amount of Greek Prose required for admission at Harvard. With Maps, Notes, References to GOODWIN'S GREEK GRAMMAR, and parallel References to CROSBY'S and HADLEY'S GRAMMARS. Second edition, edited by Professor W. W. Goodwin, of Harvard College. 12mo. Half morocco. 384 pages

The revised edition contains the first and second books of the Anabasis (in place of the third and fourth books of the former editions) with copious notes, the greater part of the second book and an extract from the seventh of the Hellenica, with the first chapter of the Memorabilia, of Xenophon; the last part of the Apology, and the beginning and end of the Phaedo, of Plato; selections from the sixth, seventh, and eighth books of Herodotus, and from the fourth book of Thucydides.

GOODWIN'S SELECTIONS FROM XENOPHON

AND HERODOTUS. With Notes adapted to Goodwin's Greek Grammar, Parallel References to Crosby's and Hadley's Grammars, and copper-plate Maps. Edited by Professor W. W. Goodwin and John Williams White, of Harvard College. 12mo. Half morocco 408 pages

This book contains the first four books of the Anabasis, and the greater part of the second book of the Hellenica, of Xenophon; and extracts from the sixth, seventh, and eighth books of Herodotus. It has been prepared for the use of those who from want of time or for other reasons are unable to read the greater variety of selections in Greek Prose which are contained in Goodwin's Greek Reader.

THE FIRST FOUR BOOKS OF THE ANABASIS OF XENOPHON. Edited, with copious Notes and References to Goodwin's Greek Grammar, Parallel References to Crosby's and Hadley's Grammars, and a copper-plate Map, by PROFESSOR W. W. Goodwin and JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, of Harvard College. 12mo. Half morocco. 240 pages

LEIGHTON'S GREEK LESSONS. Prepared to accompany Goodwin's Greek Grammar. By R. F. LEIGHTON, Master of Melrose High School. 12mo, Half morocco, 264 pages .

This work contains about one hundred lessons, with a progressive series of exercises (both Greek and English), mainly selected from the first book of Xenophon's Anabasis. The exercises on the Moods are sufficient, it is believed, to develop the general principles as stated in the Grammar. The text of four chapters of the Anabasis is given entire, with notes and references. Full vocabularies accempany the book

	LIDDELL & SCOTT'S GREEK-ENGLISH LEXI-
	CON. Abridged from the new Oxford Edition. New Edition. With Appendix of Proper and Geographical Names, by J. M. Whiton. Square 12mo. 835 pages. Morocco back. Sheep binding
•	LIDDELL & SCOTT'S GREEK-ENGLISH LEXI- CON. The sixth Oxford Edition unabridged. 4to. 1,881 pages. Morocco back Sheep binding
1	The English editions of Liddell & Scott are not stereotyped; but each has been thoroughly revised, enlarged, and printed anew. The sixth edition, published in 1868, is larger by one eighth than the fifth, and contains 1,865 pages. It is an entirely different work from the first edition, the whole department of etymology having been rewritten in the light of modern investigations, and the forms of the irregular verbs being given in greater detail by the aid of Veitch's Catalogue. No student of Greek can afford to dispense with this invaluable Lexicon, the price of which is now for the first time brought within the means of the great body of American scholars.
,	PLATO'S APOLOGY OF SOCRATES AND CRITO. Edited by John Williams White, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Greek in Harvard University.
1	The basis of this work will be the German edition of Dr. Christian Cron. (Platons Vertheidigungsrede des Sokrates und Kriton. Sechste Auflage. Leipzig, Teubner, 1875.) To the matter contained in Dr. Cron's edition there will be added notes by the Editor and from other sources, analyses, and extended references to Goodwin and Hadley. The book will be for the class-room, and all matter not of direct value to the student will be rigidly excluded.

THE ŒDIPUS TYRANNUS OF SOPHOCLES. Edited, with an Introduction, Notes, and full explanation of the metres, by John Williams White, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Greek in Harvard University, 12mo. Cloth. 219 pages

THE MEDEA OF EURIPIDES. Edited, with Notes and an Introduction, by FREDERIC D. ALLEN, Ph. D., Professor in the University of

INTRODUCTION

WHITE'S FIRST LESSONS IN GREEK. Prepared to accompany Goodwin's Greek Grammar, and designed as an Introduction to his Greek Reader. By John Williams White, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Greek in Harvard University. 12mo. Half morocco. 305 pages A series of seventy-five lessons with progressive Greek-English and English-Greek exercises. Followed by a series of additional exercises on Forms, and complete

WHITON'S SELECT ORATIONS OF LYSIAS. Comprising the Defence of Mantitheus, the Oration against Eratosthenes, the Reply to "The Overthrow of the Democracy," and the Areopagitic Oration concerning the Sacred Olive-Trunk. Edited by James Morris Whiton, Ph. D.

The grammatical notes deal almost wholly with the syntax, - as befits a work of this grade, - and have been prepared with a special aim to elucidate the usage of the verb. References are made, for the most part, to Goodwin's Greek Moods and

ENGLISH-GREEK

TO

LEXICON.

GREEK

Square

Cincinnati, 12mo, Cloth. 141 pages

Tenses, and Goodwin's and Hadley's Grammars.

12mo. Cloth. 483 pages . . .

PROSE COMPOSITION. 12mo. Cloth. 280 pages

SIDGWICK'S

12mo. 151 pages

vocabularies.

YONGE'S

